DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 091 622 CG 008 866

TITLE	Non-Sexist Education for Survival.
INSTITUTION	National Education Association, Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	73
NOTE	34p.
AVAILABLE FROM	National Education Association, 1201 16th Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036 (NEA Stock No. 385-11612)
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.75 HC Not Available from EDRS. PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS	*Bias; Civil Rights; *Females; Feminism; Literature Reviews; *Nondiscriminatory Education; Sex (Characteristics); Social Values; *Stereotypes; Womens Studies; *Working Women

ABSTRACT

This collection of 11 articles focuses on sexism in education. "The Socialization Process" refers to schools which, intentionally or not, reinforce cultural and sexual stereotypes, and maintains that schools should provide a model of nonstereotypic education. "Sex Role Stereotypes" discusses certain educational conventions which still stereotype women and minorities by limiting interaction and by reinforcing beliefs about their lesser ability and value. "Education for Survival" proposes some changes necessary for non'sexist education. "Education and Economic Survival" maintains that groups without power or secure prospects of economic survival cannot effect change. "Counseling for Careers" interviews the directors of seven college placement centers to discover where they are sending women graduates. "Schools and Physical Survival" discusses women and physical activity. Many of the pluses of being a woman are described in "The Female of the Species." "Sexual Stereotypes-Psychological and Cultural Survival" relates many common stereotypes of Chicano child-rearing practices. The historical legacy and present reality of the black woman is examined in "Black Woman." "Varieties of Denial" points out sexual stereotyping in education. "Sister and Brother? Getting Ahead Together" contends that black men and women must move ahead together to eliminate racism and sexism. (Author/HMV)

Non-sexist education

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

ED 008 846

Biographical Notes

VISTULA S. CHAPMAN, Ford Foundation Doctoral Fellow, Temple University, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.

Ms. Chapman is currently studying at Temple University for the Ph.D. degree in Afro-American history. She spent a year in Germany studying at the University of Gottingen and received the B.A. degree from Lycoming College, Williamsport, Pennsylvania, where she had a dual major in German and U.S. history.

MARION CORWELL, Public Relations Staff Officer, Technical and Product Information Department, Lincoln-Mercury Division, Ford Motor Company.

Ms. Corwell was director of school relations for the Dearborn Public School System. She taught a class in public speaking at Henry Ford Community College, Dearborn, Michigan, and served as consultant on educational communications at the University of Wisconsin, Wayne State University, and the University of Illinois. She is founder and first president of the Metropolitan Detroit Chapter of the National School Public Relations Association. Ms. Corwell received both the B.A. and M.A. degrees in communication arts from Michigan State University.

JOYCE DENEBRINK, Book Editor, Media Projects, Inc., New York City.

Ms. Denebrink has worked for educational TV as well as for several magazine and publishing companies ranging in interest from women's fashions to college textbooks. She frequently has original material published and is listed in *Contemporary Authors* and *The Directory of British and American Writers*. Ms. Denebrink received the B.A. degree from Stanford University in modern European literature.

AILEEN C. HERNANDEZ, Urban Affairs and Management Consultant, San Francisco. She is currently active in expanding the housing opportunities for minority and low income persons.

Ms. Hernandez is a former president of the National Organization for Women and has served as a labor union organizer, Assistant Chief of the California Division of Fair Employment Practices, and Commissioner of the U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission. Ms. Hernandez received the B.A. degree in sociology and political science from Howard University and the M.A. degree in government from Los Angeles State College. She has also done graduate work in public administration as well as adult and nursery school education and is a graduate of International Ladies' Garment Union Training Institute.

FLORENCE HOWE, Professor of Humanities, SUNY at Old Westbury, New York.

Ms. Howe, founder and editor of *The Feminist Press* and editorial board member of *Women's Studies: An Interdisciplinary Journal*, has taught at SUNY since 1971. She previously taught at Goucher and Queens Colleges, Hofstra University, and the University of Wisconsin. Ms. Howe directed the Goucher-Baltimore City Schools Pilot Project in the teaching of poetry. She received the B.A. degree from Hunter College, the M.A. degree from Smith College, and the Ph.D. degree from the University of Wisconsin.

ELIZABETH D. KOONTZ, Coordinator for Nutritional Programs, North Carolina State Department of Human Resources, Raleigh, N.C.

Ms. Koontz is the past Director of the Women's Bureau, U.S. Department of Labor. She is a former president of the National Education Association and served as a U.S. delegate to the United Nations. For many years, Ms. Koontz was a special education teacher in North Carolina. Ms. Koontz received the B.A. degree from Livingston College and the M.A. degree from Atlanta University.

continued on the back cover.

ED 091622

Nonsexist education for survival

National Education Association
Washington, D.C. 20036

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Special thanks to all contributing authors.

The following articles are reprinted with the kind permission of the publications indicated:

"Counseling for Careers" by Joyce Denebrink (*Contact*, Fall 1972)
"Sexual Stereotypes—Psychological and Cultural Survival" by Cecilia C-R Suarez (*Regeneracion*, Volume II, Number 3)
"Sister and Brother: Getting Ahead Together" by Aileen C. Hernandez (*Contact*, Fall 1972)
"The Female of the Species" by Marion Corwell (*Contact*, Fall 1972).

Copyright © 1973
National Education Association of the United States

NEA Stock No. 385-11612

Library of Congress Cataloging in Publication Data
Main entry under title:
Nonsexist education for survival.

Includes bibliographical references.
1. Discrimination in education—United States—Addresses, essays, lectures. 2. Education of women—United States—Addresses, essays, lectures. 3. Woman—History and condition of woman—Addresses, essays, lectures. I. National Education Association of the United States.
LA210.N66 376 '.973 73-15507

CONTENTS

1. **The Socialization Process** 3
   Shirley D. McCune

2. **Sex Role Stereotypes** 5
   Louise R. White

3. **Education for Survival** 6
   Elizabeth D. Koontz

4. **Education and Economic Survival** 8
   Michele D. Russell

5. **Counseling for Careers** 10
   Joyce Denebrink

6. **Schools and Physical Survival** 14
   Celeste Ulrich

7. **Th[illegible]male of the Species** 16
   [illegible]arion Corwell

8. **Sexual Stereotypes—Psychological and Cultural Survival** 18
   Cecilia C-R Suarez

9. **Black Woman** 21
   Vistula S. Chapman

10. **Varieties of Denial** 24
    Florence Howe

11. **Sister and Brother: Getting Ahead Together** 28
    Aileen C. Hernandez

References 30

1/2

1

The Socialization Process

Shirley D. McCune

Survival, or continuing life, is often considered in the narrow terms of physical existence. This was applicable when humankind's primary concern was continuation of the species. Modern society has enhanced human survival by solving many of the known calamities of life. What is now needed is an enlarged understanding of survival and an improved quality of it. It is not enough for us to look back on our past achievements and progress. We must not be content with the present levels of survival but should continue developing alternatives for higher levels of survival.

At the individual level there are needs that maximally develop the potential of "self-actualizing" persons. Sociologists and politicians have emphasized the societal conditions that promote or inhibit individual survival and, ultimately, societal survival. Much less attention has been given to the ways that the needs for both individual and societal survival can be met.

Schools in the United States provide a setting where the concerns for individual and societal survival can mesh. Schools' ultimate responsibility is to prepare children for the roles that will contribute to survival—both individual and societal. This function represents a primary contribution to the socialization of children. In addition, schools can assist adults with the continuing socialization that is needed for adapting to an ever-changing world. Perhaps the primary ingredient schools can provide is helping children and adults examine reality directly and freshly. Too often, we apply the "spectacles of the past" to a given situation and make decisions on that basis.

One of these sets of "spectacles" is sexism . . . "the unconscious, taken-for-granted, unquestioned, unexamined, and unchallenged acceptance of the belief that the world as it looked to men was the only world."

Sex role stereotyping, the differential categorization of males and females, represents a major outcome of sexism. It results in attitudes and practices which mitigate the higher levels of survival for more than half of our population. Like a related set of "spectacles," racism . . .

> the unconscious, taken-for-granted, unquestioned, unexamined, and seldom questioned assumption that the world as it looked to Whites was the only world[1] . . .

provides a view which justifies looking at the world in stereotyped ways. Individual beliefs, attitudes, and values are developed to maintain the view from the spectacles. Similarily, societal structure is organized on the basis of these views. Criteria other than individual ability, contribution potential, or humanistic values provide the synthesis for society. People, like groups, are assigned roles. Minority groups are relegated to tasks that limit interaction, thus reinforcing existing beliefs of lesser ability and value. Similarily, females are assigned roles that emphasize characteristics necessary for home-centered activities.

Our task is to shed the spectacles for a fresh look at people and the world around us. The schools' responsibility is to help children and adults examine the persisting spectacles and develop an educational model that will permit a model for nonstereotypic education.

Socialization

Every cultural group develops a pattern of socialization or collected activities that prepare children for adult life. The pattern of these activities varies according to the values and culture of the group. Each group tends to outline the desirable "life script" or life-style depending on its values and the needs of its adults. Groups develop these scripts on the basis of those activities that are essential for the political, economic, physical, and psychological survival of its members.

In a complex society like the United States, many cultures and value systems exist. An issue in our society has been the need for maintaining a common destiny while, at the same time, recognizing the unique values and contribution of all cultures and groups. Although geography, ancestry, and economic opportunity distinguish the socialization process within groups, at least five major strands of socialization groups may be identified: Asians, Blacks, First Americans, Spanish-speaking, and White. One of the most damaging aspects of stereotyping is the presumption of similarities when they do not exist. We continue to arbitrarily prescribe behavior by refering to The American Way of Life, The American Dream, The American Value System, rather than American Ways of Life, American Dreams, American Values Systems.

To date, there is an increasing amount of evidence that sex roles for females and males are also prescribed. Below are listed a number of generalizations about sex role differentiation. Although each cultural group may vary in the degree and operationalization of these patterns, they may be considered a starting point for understanding the similarities and differences of socialization practices.

1. Male-female distinctions are the first learnings for children.[2]

2. The preschool child has already distinguished sex related standards of appropriate behavior and begins to exhibit these appropriate behaviors.[3]
3. Sex roles become more stereotyped and restrictive with increasing age.[4]
4. The male role is frequently seen as the most desirable.[5]
5. Among adults, preferable status is given to males, and male children are more highly valued than female children.[6]
6. Acceptance of traditional sex role identity is related to positive psychological adjustment for males and poorer adjustment for females.[7]
7. Females who exhibit high IQ, creativity, and originality are those who internalize cross-sexual identity, e.g., those who have exhibited "tomboy" behavior at some point in their lives.[8]

Public Schools

Perhaps one of the most difficult problems for understanding schools is the need to distinguish between the *intent* of school programs and the actual outcomes. Reimer[9] refers to the universal functions of schools: custodial care, social-role selection, indoctrination, and education in terms of skills and knowledge. In the resulting combination of these functions, schools become an effective mechanism for social control and the perpetuation of conformity, dependence on others for learning, and social stratification.

Assumptions about the outcomes of public schools are:

1. Although schools profess the promotion of equality of opportunity, they perpetuate inequality in our society. Schools profess learning as a purpose but actually "teach" institutional conformity and nonthinking.[10]
2. The curriculum, the authority structure of schools, and the policies of schools reflect social stratification and perpetuate stereotyped images of minority groups and sex roles.
3. School activities represent a feminizing or domestication training program for both boys and girls.[11]
4. Elementary school values are congruent with traditional demands of female sex roles. They reinforce obedience, social and emotional dependence, and docility.[12]
5. Secondary schools further differentiate appropriate educational activities for boys and girls, placing more emphasis on girls' preparation for marriage and child-raising.[13]
6. Girls generally excel in elementary school programs due to the congruence of expectations with traditional feminine activities.[14]
7. Underachievement of girls is evident in the drop-off at the onset of puberty. This results from the increased role conflict and the limited expectations of schools.
8. Schools evidence greater concern for the future of boys than of girls.[15]

Framework for Analysis

An attempt to understand the need for changing schools leads us back to the question of ultimate survival and the quality of that survival. One method of analysis is examining the four types of survival—physical, economic, psychological/cultural, and political. These areas do not constitute separate, independent areas of survival needs; rather they simply provide a mechanism for categorizing experiences and action implications.

Furthermore, the definition of survival needs will vary by cultural groups and by subgroups within each one. There is evidence that minority group concerns are more likely to be economic and political survival; whereas, White female concerns are psychological survival. Schools provide five basic vehicles for meeting these different survival needs. They are:

1. Curriculum—The sum total of skills and knowledge that is available to children. This category would include course requirements, textbooks, instructional materials, and the images of reality that are provided.
2. Teacher Behavior—Behavior of teachers, administrators, and the general school environment represent what has been called the "hidden curriculum." "What is taught isn't as important as learning how you have to act in society, how other people will treat you, how they will respond to you, and what the limits of respect are that will be accorded to you as you really are."
3. Physical Education and Health Education—The ascribed purpose of physical education and health education in schools is developing healthy bodies, understanding how to maintain them, and gaining positive body images.
4. Counseling—Counseling activities are frequently considered the specialized functions of testing, vocational choice assistance, and identification of mental health disorders. Counseling must be redefined to consider the affective portion of school experience. Teachers, administrators, and other students are as much a part of the counseling experience as are the professionally trained counselors.
5. Extracurricular Activities—The importance of extracurricular activities cannot be underestimated as they provide evidence of school sanctions for adult behavior. They represent the interface between societal expectations and the school experience.

Just as the overall goals and aspirations of cultural groups differ, so do the needs of groups of women and men living within these cultures. The nature of sex role differentiation in each culture varies. The needs of cultural groups may likewise vary. We need to examine alternatives for individuals and groups so that decisions may be self-determined rather than prescribed and molded by societal requirements for survival. Schools can and should provide a model of a nonstereotypic education that will ultimately ensure one's individual and societal survival.

2

Sex Role Stereotypes

Louise R. White

I am reminded of a statement by a president of the League of Women Voters. She said, "I think there may be one thing more valuable than an idea in its time and that is an idea in action, an idea made to work by the efforts of people working together, making a commitment and taking the concrete steps to bring the idea into effect."

Of the present 1,138,400 elementary school teachers, 961,500 are women. This is a fantastic resource for the furtherance of refined objectives, especially for the analysis of sex roles and forced stereotyped behavior. However, one quickly finds that eight out of ten principals are men. At the high school level the number of men and women teachers is about equal, but 97 percent of the principals are male. If these figures are valid, then we as women must share the brunt of perpetuating the differences in expectation and aspiration levels between boys and girls.

The day has passed when education can afford to stress specific learning roles according to sex. Today's educational system has taken on many of the features of a technological industry. We can assume that the process of educating people for survival is becoming the most important ingredient in our society as we move toward the twenty-first century.

Education in the past sought to prepare the individual for sex roles for working in an industrial and postindustrial society. This tradition, however, has given way to a new and more realistic one in which the education of the individual is a multipurpose task focusing on the *whole* child in the context of the *whole* society. We now educate the person, regardless of sex, to become more creative and productive.

Certain educational conventions still exist, however, that stereotype women and minorities by limiting interaction and by reinforcing beliefs about their lesser ability and value. These conventions constitute a negative "hidden curriculum" that shapes the interests and concerns of children from a very early age. By the time they are in the fourth grade, girls' visions of the occupations open to them are often limited to four: teacher, nurse, secretary, and mother. The self-fulfilling prophecy also exists within many classrooms. What the teacher expects is usually what the teacher gets. If she expects the girls to be quiet and nonassertive, the teacher generally gets quiet, nonassertive girls. If the girls are expected to excell academically, they usually do. This is a very positive element in a classroom if a teacher has realistic expectations for each individual child, but when expectations include unquestioned obedience from all the girls, or poor academic performance from all the boys, such expectations become very harmful to the individual child.

One must explore the facts and fictions of stereotypes. In a recent survey conducted by the Institute for Social Research at the University of Michigan, some sex differences related to attitudes were explained by the researchers as being the result of childhood socialization practices which " . . . discourage the training of girls to work on their own." This study showed a significant difference between men and women in their desires to be free to decide how to do their jobs. The men attached greater importance to such freedom. Women were also less concerned than men about getting ahead on their jobs, and significantly more women than men said that they never wanted to be promoted. The study discovered that women's attitudes toward promotion were strongly tied to their expectations of being promoted.

Since these findings have serious implications for education, it would seem appropriate to examine those deficiencies which lead to human failure and to begin to develop alternatives. Education should redirect itself, supporting women and minorities to develop and utilize their potential.

It is my hope that educators, parents, and legislators will examine those conditions under which meaningful educational change can occur. Among the many possible ideas to consider, let me suggest at least three requisites for meaningful change:

1. Recognition that all intelligence does not originate at school but that some emanates naturally from within the community itself, forming a rich hybrid of learning.
2. A "freeing of the atmosphere" by educators with respect to what skills go best with which sex. Survival is dependent upon enlargement of our own understanding of past achievement and progress. Life is dependent upon a more thorough search for alternatives which will include all people regardless of sex, race, or creed.
3. NEA's continuing impact on the U.S. Office of Education with specific input to shape its activities.

We will have taken a giant step toward educating the children of our country for survival when the product of education becomes more important than the container, when the educational atmosphere has become flexible enough so that females can make educational choices without fear of being stigmatized, and when educators can admit that there are many unexplored avenues to educational development.

3

Education for Survival

Elizabeth D. Koontz

Prison uprisings, drug addiction, alcoholism, suicide, poverty, hunger, welfare, job dissatisfaction, unemployment, underemployment, campus unrest, political decision—what do these words bring to your mind?

Educators can do more about these problems than they realize by examining some of the schools' contradictions. Schools profess to promote equality of opportunity with the search for truth and learning for living as one purpose. This must be examined in terms of processes, structures, practices, and the assumptions of educators, school boards, and parents.

The Women's Bureau was established 52 years ago at the instigation of women who deplored the conditions under which women and children were forced to work in factories. The Women's Bureau and the Children's Bureau were established by acts of Congress.

Today we seldom hear of violations of the child labor laws, but only in recent years has concern been expressed about eliminating discrimination against women. What has brought this about? Two events have promoted the movement toward equal opportunity of the sexes: the influx of women into the war industries during World War II and the civil rights movement of the 60's. Youth culture has also played a significant role by changing life-styles for youth and adults.

Schools can be a vital agent for change. But if individuals are to expect economic, psychological, cultural, political, and physical survival, the schools themselves must change. The attitudes of educators, school boards, communities, and the politicians who control school funds must change. Curriculum, methodology, textbooks, policies and practices, and focus must also change.

Why such emphasis on the schools? Simply because the school system is the institution through which we expect all citizens to gain knowledge of the traditions, mores, and culture they are to perpetuate. If that system perpetuates biases and prejudices that limit development of one's self-concept and ability, it must be examined to ascertain the reasons for failure, and it must take corrective action.

Let's look at some of the problems:

Education is expensive and will grow more expensive in the future. People want to "get their money's worth." When you mention "welfare" you get different reactions. Much emotion accompanies expressions such as "taxing me to support those who won't work and live better than I," or speaking of minorities as "lazy, shiftless, and not wanting to accept work." What contributes to this condition is the political process. What do schools have to do with this?

Schools prepare one to cope with the world in which he or she lives and will survive. Notice that I said "he or she." That's first. Our language can determine a whole chain of events, decisions, policies, and kinds of behavior. The implications become quite evident when generic uses of "he" become literal translations for preferences as well as for success and failure. Females make up more than half of the population, but we regard them as secondary in most instances, and schools reflect that status.

Schools *reflect* society to a greater extent than they *develop* society's attitudes. Although we have become an industrial country, we have not progressed much beyond the limited ideas about women that were assigned by the previous agrarian society. We still have "women's work" and "men's work" even though mechanization and automation have changed and virtually eliminated men's heavy and rough work. Parental care of children has been almost completely assigned to women as a carry-over from earlier days when women were required to work at home. Men worked outside the home to provide food, shelter, and fuel. Despite the fact that all male duties of the home have been so modernized that women can now take care of them, little has been done so that women can share the child-rearing responsibilities with men. *Herein lies most of the problem.*

Somehow our society has tied women's roles as childbearers to every other aspect of their identity. From this fact we determine our rationale for the following decisions:

1. Women should not be permitted to hold jobs traditionally performed by men because families would break down if women worked. This means women can cook, clean, plow, run tractors, repair machinery, drive cars, and haul children, groceries, or furniture, but they must not work at the same jobs for pay or in competition with men.
2. Women should work at jobs such as nursing, caring for children, waiting on others, teaching, or in certain departments in factories. This means in industry women should stick to the jobs that have been broken down so that the pay for them can be reduced and women encouraged to take them.
3. Women should receive training only for those kinds of jobs associated with homemaking and improving their attractiveness unless, as during World War II, they are asked to do nontraditional jobs that pay well and include child-care facilities. This means women can do any kind of work when society needs them. But when

women themselves need to work at better jobs, they should be protected against themselves and kept out of competition.

4. Every woman needs more protection than a man from certain jobs because a woman's contribution is made when she is a good wife and mother, caring for her family's needs, and when she is a noble servant. This means that a woman should get a man and bear children and take care of the home for which she will be rewarded with care for the rest of her life and need not worry about the problems of the world.
5. Every woman should be trained from birth to use her "femininity" to get her father's favors and copy her mother's ways. She should sit still and look pretty while boys play rough games. She is rewarded for being quiet while boys are rewarded for being assertive. For performing her household duties she will receive compliments such as, "I don't know what we'd do without you." This means women are supposed to wait on others who are grateful for not having to do anything that smacks of boredom, routine, and drudgery.
6. Girls should attend a school where they learn the attitudes and roles they are expected to assume as women. This means in nursery school both sexes learn what toys are for which sex and that boys give the orders and girls take the orders. They learn that fathers go to work and mothers stay home to take care of the house and the children. Fathers know how to do many things, but mothers can only "mommy."

This further means that throughout the grades, schoolbooks portray girls and women in the limited roles of housewife and mother, passively following the orders of others, with no opinions of their own, and usually asking the males for opinions and answers. Girls are not supposed to have the brain power to do arithmetic. That is a man's subject. She learns from teachers and counselors that she should concentrate on getting married and being a good wife; therefore, studies are necessary just for getting a diploma. Learning to type is something to "fall back on" until she hooks that man. Boys are led to believe that they are superior at learning math, science, physics, and the solid subjects and that only a sissy would be interested in learning to cook, sew, iron, or do hair.

The curriculum has reinforced myths that educators cannot explain rationally. You read or hear:

> It is our philosophy that every person deserves the opportunity to develop to the full extent of his ability.

Therein lies the trouble. Remember the generic use of "he" or "his." Schools have predetermined what the potential is for a boy or a girl and have categorized it as the same for all members of one sex and completely different for the other sex.

Now it is time to look at reality. Fifty-one percent of the population is female, and women make up 40 percent of the work force. They receive earnings much lower than men because of the different kind of work they do and because of unequal pay when the work is the same. This is now under attack, and discrimination on the basis of sex is clearly illegal. Some 35 million dollars have already been awarded in back pay because of violations.

Women work because of economic need, not for fun and luxuries. Almost two-thirds of the women working are single, divorced, deserted, widowed, or married to men earning less than $7,000 a year. Many women are heads of families. Of the 51 million families in the U.S., one out of nine is headed by a woman. Among minorities, this rises to four out of ten. And many women work even when they have children under three years of age.

Only a small percentage of women are managers or even skilled craftspersons. They are seldom doctors or lawyers. And though they are teachers, they are seldom principals or superintendents. Why? Mainly because of sex stereotyping that schools permit and even perpetuate.

But stereotyping does not end there. The sex roles assigned by minority cultures prohibit women's economic independence because the majority culture has set forth certain characteristics for males and females based on myths.

One of these myths is that the wife does not work. This is not realistic. The fact is that the great middle class of this country exists because both husband and wife have worked for many years and still do. But the myth persists, and minority males suffer from the weight of what is prescribed in order to be called a "man." He must be able to support a family singlehanded. Minorities in general need the combined incomes of all adults in the family to attain a decent level of existence. So do many families among the White majority, but the minorities do not know this. Another proof of manhood is associated with the ability to produce children. This becomes part of the larger population problem when women are taught that bearing children is their greatest contribution. What will the schools train women for, once the necessity for population control is widely accepted?

You might think of the needs of our society in urban planning, management of social institutions, crafts, services of all kinds and ask: "Why are we selecting from only a small segment of the society the ones to be trained, employed, or recruited for special responsibilities? Do the schools know the needs for survival that different sexes and groups have? Are the schools ignoring the signals of these needs?"

The signals are prison uprisings, drug addiction, alcoholism, depression and mental illness, job dissatisfaction, divorce rates, underemployment and unemployment and their relationship to such crimes as prostitution, where the seller goes to jail and the buyer goes free. We need to ask what the schools might be doing about these problems and their causes.

If the schools hamper one's chances for survival, I don't believe it is intentional. Since it is happening largely from ignorance, insensitivity, or unawareness, why not start now to do something about it all over this land?

Finally, we must ask what the schools are doing to make each individual feel good about herself or himself, even though our living conditions are the result of discrimination.

4

Education and Economic Survival

Michele D. Russell

To responsibly address the question of education for survival in an American economic context, it is necessary to first summarize the guiding principles and current organization of our economic environment. Those guiding principles, briefly stated, are—

The maximization of profit;
Perpetual economic expansion
Rapid technological change
The monopolization of decision-making power and material resources.

The human costs of such priorities are—

Wealth, consolidation, and internationalization at the top and poverty, division, and domestication at the bottom (where all of us are)

The instability which is the product of the necessity to constantly expand

Extensive work force stratification which is the structural solution both to keeping technological innovation the property of small and carefully selected groups of people and to substituting status for power and masking the fundamental class divisions which exist in this country. This stratification, tailored to the demands of rapid technological change and the atomization of working peoples' consciousness, results in such phenomena as—

Planned obsolescence
Job displacement through automation and industries moving abroad
Creation of new work categories to cool out dissent (i.e., professionalism)
Widespread disenfranchisement
Narrowing notions of self-interest among the broad population.

In this society, "division of labor" equals stratification, specialization, and regimentation of tasks. "Development" is equivalent to rapid technological change, obsolescence, acceleration, and speed-up. "Success" means competitive individual upward mobility.

The elements in the educational system which socialize folk to "fit in," or survive, in fact, are precisely those things which we don't like. Divisions among people which prefigure labor force stratification are maintained by the testing and tracking systems which are racist, sexist, and class-biased. The dehumanization process is intensified by the rise in the educational technology of teaching machines and the managerial style of performance contracting. These are all things we point to very often when we are identifying the failures and negative aspects of educational experience. What we are slow to learn is that the ability of the school system to develop and protect these methods of instruction is an index of the *success* of the educational system in training students to accept and perpetuate the underlying irrational organization of the whole society.

In that context, when government and financial institutions talk about revitalizing the economy by "pursuing full utilization of human resources," they are not talking about changing the distribution of power in this country. They are not talking about eliminating racism, sexism, and class favoritism. When they talk about equipping the schools to "work effectively" with the "disadvantaged," they are not talking about liberating the nonwhite and female parts of the population from the traditional roles they have played in American society. They are simply talking about organizing our labor differently so as to more efficiently control, predict, and incorporate our energies into the mainstream of those guiding principles outlined earlier. The effects of this reality on Black men—and women of all races—is extremely debilitating.

Black men are trapped in careers that are most prone to either physical hazards, rapid turnover, or displacement. Those who are pushed out of school find themselves either

in some branch of the armed forces, on the assembly line, or in the relief line—all of which guarantee a very short life. If a Black man is lucky and has some kind of professional white-collar training, he will find himself in an occupation that isolates him from everybody else. Alternatively, he will be tracked into a staff position in a large organization and will have nothing to do with defining how that institution is organized. He will have a show-case position, whether as an EEO person, a counselor, or an organizational psychologist, whose job is to rationalize his own continued isolation, everybody else's displacement, and the distance between himself and his Black brothers and sisters at lower levels of the economy. If socially minded, he might become a social worker or a parole officer (really, variations on the same theme). Then his job is explicit surveillance and informing on the most alienated and oppressed sections of the community—keeping them in a dependent relationship to the state apparatus, begging for enough autonomy to survive, but never given enough leeway to prevail over their misery.

If I were Frantz Fanon and this were Algeria, I would be talking about a "national bourgeoisie" or a "native class of colonizers" in the Black community who themselves are victims. Since I'm here in the United States, I can just talk about a professional Black elite whose status, comfort, and identity are dependent precisely on the effectiveness with which they keep other Black people down. That's one thing that happens to Black men when economic survival through career development is pursued without challenging the whole ideological basis of advancement and success in this society.

Women of all races undergo a different process in terms of being "useful" to the economic and social order. Women in the labor force are concentrated at the bottom of the system. The schools track women students into maintenance and socialization work—as cooks, maids, seamstresses, nurses, secretaries, and teachers—for which society does not pay well. We fill the most permanent basic, necessary, and fundamentally stable jobs in the economy. But this economy is organized not to value those activities which are humanly necessary. When we predominate in an industry, such as textiles, the managers are men. Other occupations open to us are mainly in the social service sector or in "paper pushing." We are tracked as a group into work which maintains the smooth flow and the stability of the economy, not into expanding areas where there is room to grow. The characteristics required for the jobs we do are those such as patience, physical endurance, low status-needs, acceptance of routine, which increase the tendency to keep us in our place. But these are the same qualities that help us survive. This is the reality that we live with.

If we are to commit ourselves to alleviating the major problems of American society and deal seriously with the contradiction of widespread poverty and disenfranchisement in an economy of abundance, we must be prepared to combat racism, sexism, and the class structure upon which America is based. Each of the groups who are without power, without secure prospects of economic survival, without equal access to the institutions which control our lives—each and all of us must begin by defining the task as the formation of a collective movement for a redistribution of all the priorities and a redefinition of the guiding principles of American society. Piecemeal solutions in the form of increased status, individual sinecures, and even the psychological lift that comes from positive cultural identity are, in the long run, insufficient to guarantee our collective survival.

The struggle for total redefinition begins at birth. The development of consciousness, itself, is a cradle-to-grave process. The consolidation of consciousness into institutional forms is our work. That's what we do as teachers. We must choose which life possibilities our institutions will mirror and commit ourselves to shaping them in that image. Our choices will determine the terms on which all of us are willing to survive and whether, in fact, we can prevail.

5

Counseling for Careers

Joyce Denebrink

As usual, the reality can be better than fantasy. Consider this: the recession is ending. Lockheed is beginning to hire. Hundreds of Seattle's unemployed converge for the interviews. And who is the first engineer Lockheed hires? Like the sometime description of God, *she's Black*.

Today, reality is more often played out like this: one of New York's largest banks is planning to hire more women for more responsible jobs. It has to. The U.S. Department of Labor's Revised Order No. 4, issued March 1972, demands that companies doing business with the government hire and promote women or risk losing out on Federal funds or contracts. But how can they? Due to the recession, the bank has just had to lay off 1,200 people. Wait; all is not lost—there is an opening in the research department. An assistant vice-president begins interviewing. Finding that the last woman to hold this particular job has gotten bored, gotten pregnant, quit, the assistant vice-president, despite pressure from bank officials, hires a man. What sort of assistant vice-president would be such a chauvinist? A *woman* assistant vice-president.

Can women be admitted as equals into the working world? If ever there was a time it might be possible, this is it. Why? To use two of business's favorite concepts, there is a demand for women in business, and there is a supply of them available. Business, pressured by government to hire women, just as it was pressured to hire Blacks, and no longer able to get women to accept the kind of jobs they used to accept, is beginning to offer them higher status and more pay. And women, who were beginning to reject the secretarial route even before women's lib came along, now are finding their expectations changing even more, and they are becoming ever more willing to get the training they need for the careers they want.

It would seem to be a good time to be a woman, especially a Black woman. For, if anyone does, business knows how to take advantage of, as well as offer, a two-for-one opportunity.

Except it's not such a good time. There's a recession going on. If the ship of state is sinking, are the women and children still the first to go?

To find out, we decided to begin where careers do—at college placement offices around the country. We talked to career planning directors at two Black women's colleges (Bennett and Spelman), two Black coed universities (Howard and Shaw), and three Ivy League women's schools (Barnard, Mt. Holyoke, and Vassar). We wanted to find out what career planning directors see and to hear what they advise.

The first thing that career directors try to do is to reach the undergraduates when they are freshmen, if they can, and point out to them all the careers that exist besides the traditional teaching, nursing, and secretarial ones. And while they claim they would not deter the determined humanities or social sciences major, the directors remind students that the job market for the liberal arts graduate is no better than it ever was. If they can, they deflect undergraduates into more scientific or computational fields such as biology, math, or economics. Some, like Bennett, point women in the direction of training for student personnel work at the college level.

How good a job are the college placement offices doing? Are they the places for the graduating seniors to go to find jobs? Or is going to one just one of those rituals a woman goes through with more hope than expectation, after she's been through the freshman mixer, and before she tries computer dating? The chances of finding a job are like that of finding a man: problematical. For instance, Mt. Holyoke's Vocational Planning and Placement Office doesn't even

consider itself a placement service. Its far-less-ambitious attempt is to help students learn what they want to do and help them learn how to present themselves in the best light. The graduates then tend to go back to where they came from or go on to where they want to be and then begin to job hunt. And only about half of Howard's seniors use their Placement and Career Planning Center; the other half wait until they graduate before they get serious about getting a job. And by the time the summer is half over, only about half of Bennett's graduates have jobs. But placement services are good for education majors like Shaw's, who tend to get teaching jobs before they graduate. This enables them to take advantage of one of the great benefits of teaching—the three-month vacation—before they even start to work.

Once the seniors graduate, the career-planning directors tend to think of them not as people with jobs or people without jobs, but merely as alumnae. They try to keep track of them out of some form of statistical curiosity, usually by sending out a questionnaire a year after graduation, but they only hear from the people who want to be heard from and, after that, they pretty much lose track of where people are and what they are doing.

When they graduate, where do the graduates go? Some to places they have traditionally gone—rushing into teaching or secretarial work or marriage. But in ever-decreasing numbers. Shaw, for instance, still sends the greatest percentage of its graduates—30 percent—into teaching. "The women will accept teaching jobs," said Miss Joyce Cooke, Counselor of Cooperative Education and Career Guidance, "but they're not enthusiastic." And although woman's lib is virtually unknown on campus, the women are demanding equal pay for their work.

The perennial career nadir, secretarial work, is universally scorned. (Six secretarial jobs went begging at Vassar last June.) Business has invested the job with more responsibility and a new name, "administrative assistant," but women are still approaching it with a wary eye. Who, then, will do the typing? You well may ask.

And even marriage, the long-time-champion career alternate, is often replaced by just living together or, as the case may be, living around.

In their stead, unlikely employers appear on the horizon: since they are coming to schools that are turning out liberal arts graduates for the most part, the range of their offers is not as diverse as it might otherwise be. But they are offering jobs to women, and in greater quantity, than they ever have before. Insurance companies come, recruiting sales*women*. So do pharmaceutical companies. Textbook publishing companies come looking for "college traveler" saleswomen. Mobil Oil, General Electric and IBM have come to Mt. Holyoke looking for women for marketing positions, but it seems that relatively few women are ready for such a non-traditional role. And this fall, for the first time, Gulf Oil, the Whirlpool Corporation, and Jones and Laughlin Steel Corp. are coming to Vassar. The Norton Company of Worcester, Massachusetts, which makes machine tools, and Hughes Aircraft of Culver, California, showed up at Vassar. (Hughes took off with two Vassar seniors, giving them each starting salaries of $10,600.) The retail merchandising industry is making a great effort to hire Blacks, said Spelman's Director of Counseling Service, Mrs. Caroline W. Graham. "New York's Consumer Distribution Group is finding management-training positions for Blacks and really moving them up." One of Spelman's students spent a summer working at Bloomingdales', then went back after graduation as an assistant buyer.

At schools like Bennett, said Zepplyn Humphrey, their Director of Career Counseling and Placement, the Federal government is a big employer. It offers summer internship programs for college juniors, and students who take advantage of this job experience can waive the difficult Federal Service Entrance Exam.

The Armed Forces, typically, is recruiting women in order to "relieve men to do other things." But a graduate can become a commissioned officer, go to school for a masters degree, then resign with it at the end of two years.

One of the best job entries for a woman with a B.A. is to get into a management training program in business or industry. These graduates, instead of having to start out as secreataries, now are being given on-the-job professional training in such areas as industrial management, research and development, product control, systems analysis, computer programming, and data processing.

Are women—and are Black women—discriminated against by college recruiters? In the crucible of the college placement office, it is hard for career-planning directors to know what to make of what they see. Women interview for more jobs than they want, then graduate and disappear without telling anyone what has become of them. And recruiters get around charges of discrimination by interviewing anyone and everyone—and then disappear before telling anyone who will get the jobs they have to offer. But even if business and industry are not hiring the best women college graduates, it may be that they cannot—for the best women college graduates may well be the ones who go on to graduate school.

Why would they do a thing like that? Perhaps because some women think of themselves no differently than men think of themselves, and they go for the professional training that will enable them to have life-long careers comparable to those men have.

Some go for less obvious reasons. "I don't think that graduate school does anything but delay the inevitable," said Sam Hall, Director of Placement and Career Planning

at Howard University. "Many women attempt to go to graduate school as an alternate to no job at all. They're just hoping the situation will get better." In any event, it does seem to be the case that the harder jobs get to find, the more graduates go to graduate school.

Whatever the motivation, the statistics are impressive. eventually half of Vassar's graduates go on to graduate school. And while about 45 percent of Mt. Holyoke's graduates go on, too, almost all her Black graduates continue with their education.

In graduate school, humanities students tend to stay in their previous fields—history, clinical psychology, Hispanic studies, library science, and the like. But a relatively new phenomenon is the increasing number of women now going for a Masters of Business Administration. This degree will enable them to be Certified Public Accountants, marketing analysts, and to do things like move right into the top executive posts in retailing, merchandising, and marketing firms.

And a lot of women are going on to professional schools to study law, medicine, and dentistry. Graduates seem to be discriminated against less in the professions than in business; perhaps because they are hired more on the basis of being lawyers, doctors, and dentists than of being women. Law, in fact, seems to be replacing social work as a field through which women feel they can effect social change. Some women ease into it tentatively. Vassar graduates, for instance, are going to law firms to do paralegal work now and plan to go on to law school if they like the experience.

It would seem, then, to be the coming together of the best of all possible worlds: business is willing to offer good jobs to women; women want to accept and are becoming trained for these jobs. There is just that one impediment: due to the recession, there are very few jobs in the offing . . . and for the taking.

When the recession came, was discrimination far behind? Mrs. Caroline W. Graham of Spelman College claims that when the job market contracted in '70, '71, and '72, there was discrimination, and the recession was used as an excuse. "It's an awful indictment," she said, "but I'm making it. Although Black women made an inroad into the job market from '68 to '70, there was no full-fledged hiring. Some companies went beyond the call of duty. With others it was tokenism all the way through or nothing at all. This year," she continued, "out of 75 graduating seniors who interviewed almost daily with recruiters from business and industry, only six women had job offers." And as for the progress of the women who are now working in business and industry, she can't really tell. "Companies promote from within, and we haven't been within very long."

Certainly business used the opportunity to cut back on the deadwood among its employees, and to cut out some of its jobs. "Jobs women flopped into a year and a half ago have now dried up," said Mrs. Jane Gould, Director of Placement and Career Planning at Barnard. "There are less jobs now, but they are more substantive." She is furious about a situation she sees repeatedly: when companies recruit for these jobs, they tend to play women against Blacks. ("We can't help you with women this year," they'll say. "This year we're hiring Blacks.") "They shouldn't be permitted to get away with this!" she said.

"The job market is really good for neither Black men nor women, but it's better for women. They've got two for one," said Howard's Sam Hall. In terms of hiring, "The Federal government is probably the worst culprit," he said. "There's a good possibility the Federal Service Entrance Exam isn't a fair test for Blacks. And despite a flurry of hiring at certain levels, the government has not taken a lead in showing private industry how to hire Blacks."

Things being what they are, what do career planning directors advise? Sam Hall noted that there are more requests for minorities than five years ago and thus a greater opportunity for hiring. "But," he pointed out, "Blacks are not being educated in the fields that need them. Blacks make up less than two percent of the total engineers in the country. And in June of '72, there were only a total of 300 engineering graduates in the country. Five years ago, companies were after 'people,' and they hired people in any field. But since most companies that depend on government contracts are largely technical, when a recession forces them to cut back, it forces them to cut back to technically trained people. They must still hire Blacks, but so few are technically trained that they can't take advantage of the situation." He doubts that companies will hire again at the rate they hired in the '60s, and he sees an increasing number of educated people being increasingly underemployed. "It will cause problems in the future," he said. "Like the people who graduated in the '30s and were not absorbed into the work force, these people will bring pressure to bear on the country."

Given a job, how do women fare financially? While women may be happy to be doing the work of men, it's the equal opportunity employer who gets to laugh all the way to the bank, for the top average starting salaries for men and women in the same fields are not equal. In fact, The College Placement Council is still releasing *two* salary surveys of be-

ginning offers by business and industry—one for men and one for women. Their statistics tell it like it is: average starting salaries for June college graduates in chemical engineering were $928 per month for men and $893 per month for women. For accounting graduates, it was $854 per month for men and $829 per month for women. And in business and public administration, the field with the most job openings for women, men received $726 per month and women $643 per month, 11 percent less.

What's a woman to do? One ploy that worked required the united efforts of all the women employees at a major educational TV station. It was television-as-usual for awhile, especially for the two highest-paid women producers, who were each making $1,840 a month and busily turning in expense accounts that would reimburse them for their meals with associates (or supper money if they ate alone—$4 after a 10-hour day, $8 on Saturdays and Sundays), garage fees for their cars (or taxi money home after 8 p.m.), and for any items that would enhance their cultural awareness, such as all their books, LPs, and tickets to movies and plays. Then one day they discovered their salaries were less than those of the lowest-paid male producers. Did they each go in for a private conference with the boss? No. They called a conference of all the women, on company time. They asked each woman to write down her name, experience and salary on a pad of paper they passed around. Many of the women were torn between their reluctance to reveal their salary and their curiosity to find out everyone else's. And curiosity, of course, carried the day. The list was edited, typed, Xeroxed, and distributed using company time, materials, machines, and people. And the men were intimidated into revealing their salaries, and that list went around, too. All at once everyone knew all the glaring inequities. (Many of the most glaring inequities were between the people who had been at the station for many years with few raises and the people who had been brought in from more highly paying stations at matching salaries.) And there was nothing that a management who claimed to be fair-minded could do but claim the same sense of surprise at the inequities and adjust the salaries. To be sure, the first two salaries they adjusted were those of the two women producers, and that effectively ended their continued interest in, and organization of, the cause of sisterhood.

What sort of women are these who today are bringing pressure to bear on business? And what sort of process are today's women going through? What do they want? "The 17-to-21-year-olds are confused as to who they are and what they're going to be," said Barnard's Mrs. Jane Gould. "They're products of their environments, so they still have to deal with the traditional role expectations. They're ambivalent of these roles, yet fearful of independent roles. But while they used to have to run to marriage or graduate school, they're now learning to not be defined by what they do. That takes more independence. Women expect more of their jobs in the beginning. And when women get out in the world, they gain more strength. Women who have been out of school a few years have sensed discrimination, and they're angry. Some are married and have children, yet they're doing the most amazing things. And they're beginning to look for professions, not jobs. The time is coming when women will take themselves seriously."

Mrs. Mary Bodel, Vassar's Director of Career Planning, thinks that the woman's lib movement has helped everyone acknowledge the flexibility of moving about in the middle jobs of the working world. "Women no longer think of themselves as quitters if they change jobs, and companies are willing to look at people for $15,000 to $20,000 jobs who have had no experience in that particular field. They're discovering that if a woman has a good resume, a good interview, and if she has something they want, she doesn't need previous experience in that area."

Different women come back to alumnae offices for different reasons. The women who return to Howard for advice are mostly working women who want to change jobs. "These women are as career-oriented as men," Sam Hall says. "There seem to be a lot more bright Black women than bright Black men." Colleges with predominently white alumnae, like Mt. Holyoke, used to get women who hadn't thought of working until their children were in college. And for older alumnae who have been out of the job market, this lack of experience has ruined their self confidence. Ms. Karen Latka, Assistant Director of Vocational Planning and Placement, said, "Those who want to go back to work are in turmoil about what they can do." Nowadays the women who come back are younger, with younger children. They're coming back to find out what they can do to get ready to go back to work.

Only time will tell what women will be able to do: whether women will come out of the credentialing process and find they're not needed, or whether they will at last be accepted as man's equal in the business world. But they will be ready. They're beginning to know what they want. And what some of them are beginning to want is not a home in the suburbs, but a salary, in thousands of dollars, that will each year equal . . . their age.

6

Schools and Physical Survival

Celeste Ulrich

Descartes suggested, *"Je pense, donc je suis"*; however, I would seek to convince you that "I am, therefore I think, and feel, and act." Schools, and even societies, have subscribed to the notion that the *real* person exists within a temple of muscles, nerves, and organs called the body—the preservation of which fosters survival. My survival depends upon the behavior I manifest as I reflect the doing, feeling, and thinking domains of the totality that is me.

The idea that "I am my body" is not easily accepted by the institutions of formal education, nor is the plea of physical educators that we must foster physical survival. Education, which has bowed to reason and idolized cognition, has only recently considered the totality of the individual and recognized that the learner must feel and do, as well as think. Only through such a holistic approach will relevant education be found.

Physical educators have always endorsed holism. As we have attempted to understand the art and science of human movement, we have depended heavily upon activity to sponsor feelings and understandings. But, because action and concern do not always stem from cognition, physical education has often been a stepchild of the formal school curriculum. The traditional curriculum has usually assumed the responsibility to reflect society through rational understanding.

Education is expanding and has already started to assume more societal responsibility. The schools which reflect the social scene also reproduce stereotypes of the real-life social drama. They overtly stereotype roles according to racial, religious, and economic patterns, and they covertly and malignantly stereotype persons by sex-oriented expectations. Sex role stereotyping has seldom been recognized, even by the individuals against whom it discriminates. It is a malignancy because it endorses the fallacious idea that over 50 percent of the world's population is to be treated as second-class citizens—of less worth and from whom less is expected. The female has come to fulfill the prophecy that has been set for her.

The most highly valued American attributes are those reserved for the male. The research findings of Rosenkrantz, Broverman, Reisman, Griffin, Maccoby, Horner, and others have each demonstrated that traits identified as feminine are valued less than masculine ones. The masculine image is considered synonymous with the image of the healthy adult. We sanctify our reasoning via theories of biological determinism, historical revelation, God, male dominance,ego satisfaction, and personality development. Freud depicted the female as dependent, passive, fragile, nonaggressive, noncompetitive, empathic, sensitive, yielding, receptive, supportive, and emotionally liable. He depicted the male as independent, aggressive, competitive, task-oriented, assertive, innovative, self-disciplined, stoic, active, analytical, courageous, confident, rational, and emotionally controlled.

The terms used to describe the behaviors associated with masculine role fulfillment stem from concepts of physical strength and endurance—the two traits in which the average male bests the average female. Gender-identified traits reflect relative values in strength and endurance, an abundance of which has always been assumed valuable.

Very little research is available about female strength and endurance. Evidence is accumulating, however, to show that the strength differential is greater within each sex than between the sexes. A number of women are stronger than a great many men, and many men are less enduring than some women. The day may be approaching when a woman can aspire to values treasured for all healthy people without being considered unfeminine.

Many assumptions about the relative strength and endurance of men and women are based upon adult mean scores and may not apply to real boys and girls. The 100 best athletes from a school of 300 boys and 300 girls would contain a high percentage of females. Thus, the restrictions placed upon women in developing their fullest potential do not have a sound physiological rationale. Instead, they reflect a moral vendetta and stereotyped sex roles. The Olympics contained women who are not ashamed to be strong. The Tibetan who climbed Mt. Everest with Edmund Hillary was a 90-pound, 18-year-old female who carried equipment weighing close to 150 pounds.

To ensure the idea that women must never get "out of hand," a determined effort has reinforced the weak and fragile concept of femininity. One points with ridicule to the amazon to show what happens to girls whose muscles bulge and whose behavioral patterns cater to aggression and drive. To bulge from excess mammary tissue is one thing but to bulge from muscular tissue is another. As females reinterpret their roles, they find out that strength and endurance are not unfeminine and that bulges can be controlled. Women who affirm their bodies are beginning to feel comfortable with assertive roles and with personality characteristics of strength.

Because the internalized feelings regarding strength and endurance are so basic to our interpretations of the stereotyped sex role, it would appear that departments of physical education might act as change agents within the schools. However, blatant sexual discrimination has been most rampant in the departments of physical education. Physical education is the only sex-identified body of knowledge in the school curriculum. (You do not have boys' math and girls' math, boys' English and girls' English.) Physical education facilities, equipment, and personnel for girls have been regarded as less important than those for boys.

Women who have allied themselves with physical activity have often had to risk their feminine image, and in a world where even bicycles have a sex, that is frightening. As some insecure males felt that sports—the last bastion of masculinity—was being stormed, they acted as if they were being emasculated. Therefore, women, ever mindful of their responsibilities to booster the male, turned to the one activity pattern open—dance. They "took over" and stressed the physical traits of flexibility, agility, and coordination which reinforced the womanly attributes of grace, poise, and beauty. Men began to find dance distasteful and felt feminized when forced into such a movement pattern. The personality of the male dancer is still the object of social derision.

Nowhere has the concept of the strong woman been more dramatically represented than in the recent Olympiad. Women have been forbidden to compete against men in all activities except equitation. However, even though the activities of women Olympic contestants were held in check by a social dictum that reinforced the idea of women as weak and nonenduring, female athletes brought both strength and endurance to the Olympic activities. Male Olympic coaches incredulously lined the fences when women athletes shattered records previously thought unattainable by men or women.

As young people insist, "But I am my body," more emphasis is placed upon the self-actualization and autonomy sponsored by physical survival. The boys and girls in today's schools are not nearly as "up-tight" about sexually designated activity roles as were their parents and grandparents. Many girls do not feel unfeminine as they run, jump, climb, throw, and endure. More boys are turning to dance, synchronized swimming, and figure skating. Both participate in gymnastics, volleyball, soft ball, climbing, surfing, and a myriad of movement patterns which reflect an unbiased approach to the art and science of human movement. The "good bod" is asexual.

Physical survival is the bedrock of self-actualization. Physical educators ache to help people examine reality directly and honestly—an approach which will ameliorate individual abilities even as it enhances society. As alternate life-styles become available and we feel comfortable in believing "I am my body" without feeling that we have abandoned the stereotypes of intellectualism, scholasticism, and other gender-oriented "isms," the opportunities for economic, psychosocial/cultural, and political survival will be manifest in social self-determination. I am my body. *Je suis, donc je fais. Je pense et j'attends.*

7

The Female of the Species

Marion Corwell

My premise is: *The Female of The Species Is More . . .*

Is more what?

Well, the old saw has it that the female of the species is more *deadly* than the male. I believe the female of the species is more *lively* than the male, and I turn for proof to no less an authority than the last United States Census. You'll find—and already know—that we actually live longer these days than do the males of our society.

And there are more of us. The number of women living in the United States is 51 percent of the total, which means that women outnumber men by nearly five and a half million. But we don't start out in the majority. Up to the age of 15, there are more boys than girls, reflecting the fact that there are more boy babies than girl babies. After the age of 15, the picture is reversed and the predominance of females becomes greater with each year. Finally, in the age bracket 65 years and over, there are only 72 men for every 100 women.

Gives you pause for thought, doesn't it?

How does the female of the species score in the intelligence department?

I've read numerous studies that indicate females achieve significantly and consistently higher scores on intelligence tests than males.

At the ages of two, three and four the average IQ, as tested by the Kuhlmann-Benet test, is higher for girls than for boys.

From school age to adult life females rank significantly higher on intelligence tests than males.

The female superiority in verbal or linguistic functions is marked and consistent from infancy to adulthood.

Girls of preschool age have a larger vocabulary than boys.

Girls on the average begin to talk earlier than boys.

Girls begin to use sentences earlier than boys, and tend to use more words in sentences.

Girls learn to read earlier, and make more rapid progress in reading than boys.

Girls have few reading difficulties compared with the great number of reading disabilities among boys.

Girls excel in speed reading, tests of opposites, analogies, sentence completion and story completion.

Girls learn foreign languages much more rapidly and accurately than boys, a difference that is maintained throughout life.

Women are characterized by a more vivid mental imagery than men.

Girls are consistently more successful than boys in school progress. Girls are less frequently retarded, more frequently advanced, and promoted in larger numbers than boys.

In school grades girls consistently do better than boys, even in subjects which favor boys.

The list of pluses on the distaff side is longer, but these facts revealed by objective scientists give a clear picture of the mental ability of the female of the species.

As to women's physical stamina, there are examples all through history of women who, when faced with the necessity to be strong, came through with flying colors.

One of my favorites is of Sojourner Truth, a freed slave who went to Battle Creek, Michigan, more than 100 years ago and worked with Quakers in the Underground Railroad to rescue slaves. She made major contributions in the areas of both civil rights and women's rights.

Once in a verbal exchange with a male critic, she said:

"Nobody ever helps me into carriages or over puddles, or gives me the best place, and ain't I a woman? I ploughed and planted and gathered into barns—and ain't I a woman? I've borne 13 children, and seen most of 'em sold into slavery, and . . . I cried out with my mother's grief—and ain't I a woman?"

Given the opportunity, women can be a devastating mixture of brains and whatever else it takes to do an exemplary job.

Could it be that the phrase, "women are the weaker sex," is a giant hoax perpetrated to keep bright young girls who have great potential reared in an atmosphere that denies them the opportunity for full intellectual and creative development? A climate that has been aptly described as "an atmosphere of unexpectation."

With so many pluses on the side of the female of the species, why are women usually the last to be hired, the lowest paid, the least often promoted, and the first to be fired?

Certainly the number of men comprising the vast majority of middle-to-top executive positions gives men in the lower rungs of the various corporate ladders an advantage in getting promotions—and in landing jobs in the first place. When a man is in a position to make the decisions as to who will be hired and who will be promoted, he takes care of his own more often than not.

It takes a well-adjusted, secure man not to fear the threat

of an intelligent, competent female. Unfortunately, there aren't enough men in that category in the business world, and any doubt as to the better choice is usually resolved in favor of fellow members of the great male fraternity.

Often, it is just a matter of habit. It simply doesn't occur to an employer to put a woman in a job that has always been filled by a man. When a job becomes vacant, they automatically seek another man to fill it.

Sometimes, employers are fooled by the stereotypes about women, even though they've all been disproved by objective studies and surveys.

I believe there's another significant reason why we women in the business world are experiencing an up-hill climb.

It's women themselves. . . .

More women than I care to calculate have accepted the theory that because women are traditionally the child-bearers and cave keepers, they have no right to important roles in such things as business and politics. Too many others have retired to defeat without trying. Too many others delight in sabotaging the efforts of women who do strive to achieve.

How many times have you heard a secretary or sometimes even a professional say, "I wouldn't work for a woman"? I once knew a secretary who worked for two men and a young woman. She made this statement repeatedly in public, often in her female boss' presence, and yet she did her assigned work, usually without a complaint. She just couldn't bring herself to acknowledge she was subjected to another woman.

Men would be suspicious of another man who said, "I don't like men—I'd much rather work for a woman!" Yet many women, as a matter of pride, announce that they don't like other women. In my judgment, women who sell their sisters short and continually try to impede their progress in the business world are traitors to their sex.

I'm a normal female of the species and I like men just as much as any other woman. I believe a great many of them deserve our loyalty, affection, and support. But I honestly feel that if we women are going to continue to make important strides in the business and professional world, we have to think kindly of each other.

We have to respect each other, encourage each other, and give our sisters a boost whenever the opportunity presents itself.

As women, we have to do more than a competent job in the business world. We have to think constantly of what the effect of how we're conducting ourselves will be on the young women who'll follow us in our professions. There's no room for displays of unbridled emotion . . . for subjective thinking . . . for backbiting. You've all heard that the "trouble with being a woman these days is that you've got to look like a girl, think like a man, and work like a dog." I believe that 100 percent!

Women in business today must gain the respect of their male counterparts by the job they do and the way they do it . . . by day-to-day high-level performance.

All of you know the importance of hard work. I don't believe it's possible for a woman to be successful unless she is willing to work hard . . . Selfless application, resolute, persevering, tough-fibered.

I believe that many more women would be found on the top rungs of the management ladder if they were prepared for success. Very often people sit back and bemoan their lot, but don't do a great deal about bettering it.

America *needs* the relatively untapped ability and talent that the majority of its adult population—that's treated like a minority—has to offer.

There's power in this country's 51 per cent female population. If women would shake off their complacency and emerge—not as dedicated feminists storming the fort to mount a frontal attack against the men but as dedicated *leaders* at every level—they could be a mighty force for good and make unlimited contributions in every area of contemporary life.

Some of the attributes that contribute to success in business are imagination, enthusiasm, flexibility, initiative, and the intestinal fortitude to take it as well as to dish it out. A successful woman is usually creative, aggressive, strong, and she has the ability to analyze and solve problems. Ethical conduct also is a "must" for long-range success.

The female of the species needs more self-starters. While some hesitate to question whether their conclusions are correct, while others claim the time is not yet ripe, the woman with initiative rallies her organization together and carries the matter through.

A modern-day example is the National Coordinator for Business Opportunities for Minority Women—Inez Kaiser.

Inez started her own public relations and advertising business before it was fashionable to give Blacks a break in the business world. She based her business operation on the same guiding principle she uses in her personal life—top-notch quality always. It never occurred to her that, because she happened to be born Black, the odds were against her success. She earned two degrees and gained the expertise she needed in her chosen field, then she worked long and hard. Inez Kaiser proved that a Black woman could put it together and make it big.

Synonymous with "keeping at it" is perseverance. I like the thought once-expressed by Nobel prize-winning physicist and chemist, Marie Curie:

"We must have perseverance, and above all, confidence in ourselves. We must believe that we are gifted for something and that this thing, at whatever cost, must be attained."

The female of the species is more than a charming decoration. She's vital, she's intelligent, she's capable of unlimited contributions to the business world.

And it's up to her to prove it!

8

Sexual Stereotypes—Psychological and Cultural Survival

Cecilia C-R Suarez

A stereotype can be defined as a generalization about a group or members of a group based on emotion or faulty judgment. Stereotypes have stifled and imposed certain restrictions upon people or groups of people. In addition, stereotypes of people or groups of people have hindered their full development to contribute in our society. For instance, the stereotype of the woman as being passive and wanting to stay at home has restricted and stunted her full potential. The Chicana, that is the Mexican American woman, carries a double burden when it comes to stereotypes. For not only is she discriminated against as a woman, but she is also discriminated against as a member of an ethnic group which has a long history of prejudicial treatment by the dominant society. These stereotypes have had harmful effects, not only on the Chicana, but also on her family.

A good example of the stereotype of the Chicana is the description of Chicana child-rearing practices that have been traditionally ascribed to her. The importance of these descriptions is that many educational programs for Chicanos in operation today have used these descriptions as bases for the programs. These programs, usually termed intervention or compensatory programs, are supposed to intervene or compensate for the supposed poor home environment and inferior language and culture of the Chicano home. Child rearing can be defined as the interaction between parents and their children, their expressions, attitudes, values, beliefs, interests—the interactions representing the whole system of transactional experience in the home setting.

One type of stereotype in the area of child-rearing practices is the one that lumps all low income families as the same. Ira Gordon, for instance, describes the so-called "disadvantaged" as being disorganized, having low levels of expectations and having disciplinary patterns which use force (verbal and physical). I would like to comment on the aspect of disorganization in the low income environment because this description is used by many authors. Coming from a family of eleven (I was the tenth of eleven children) my mother was so organized, that if she had not been this way, she would not have been able to put a meal on the table. And my family stress on organization is typical of large Chicano families. As for low levels of expectations, I know of no Chicana mother that does not want the best for her child and has the highest of expectations. Martin Deutsch and McVicker Hunt, whose studies came out in the mid-sixties, were main contributors to the theory of the disadvantaged, that is that the low income family's environment was supposed to be disadvantaged and deficient and the child coming from this environment needed special enrichment in order to catch up with the white, English-speaking, middle class child. Deutsch describes the middle class life as more likely to produce opportunities for the normal growth of the child. According to him, the slum conditions have a detrimental effect on the physical and mental development of the ghetto child. He paints a dismal picture of the low income family, one that furnishes few learning opportunities because the parents are unaware and unable to prepare the child for school and because the low income environment is lacking in intellectual stimulation. Hunt blames the low income child's environment for his academic failure. He specifically criticizes the crowded living conditions and the slum environment. Although the research is not on the Chicano, it is applied to him as well.

Culture in the barrio may in fact be too stimulating for some of the insensitive researchers who view a culture that is different from theirs as inferior. First of all, the barrio residents' speech may be varied. They may be monolingual

(speaking either Spanish or English), bilingual (speaking Spanish and English, Spanish and Calo—barrio slang—or English and Calo), or trilingual (speaking Spanish, English, and Calo). Our Spanish language is full of dichos, proverbs, just about one for any occasion. Children run home in the dark after hearing one of the many versions of the folktale, La Llorona (the Weeping Woman). The children play such games as La Tablita, Naranja Dulce, Limon Partido, and La Vibora. The barrio uniquely celebrates birthdays, saint's days, religious days, and holidays. Who in a Chicano family cannot remember being awakened by the Mexican birthday song, "Las Mananitas?" Folk dances such as the Jarabe Tapatio (the Mexican Hat Dance), the "Chiapanecas," or "La Bamba" are part of our celebrations. Our music is rich and varied, from the flutes of the Yaqui Deer Dances, to the harps of the Veracruz music, to the stirring falsettos of the mariachis, to the music of today's Latin Rock bands—El Chicano, Santana, and Azteca. The corrido, the Mexican folk ballad, describes not only events, heroes, and legends from the Mexican Revolution such as Adolita and Pancho Villa, but Chicano folk heroes such as Texas' Jacinto Trevino and California's Joaquin Murieta as well as contemporary Chicano heroes like Cesar Chavez and Ruben Salazar. No, our barrio environment is not lacking in stimulation—it is lacking in sensitive researchers who can relate to the Chicano culture. But tragically, the writings of the previously mentioned Hunt and Deutsch have been parroted again and again and have been the bases for many educational programs for Chicanos.

But there have been writings specifically describing the Chicano family. These writers have theorized that the Chicano child is deprived, disadvantaged, and handicapped because of the child-rearing practices of the home, and of course the Chicana mother is to blame. One study that has been accepted as authoritative, and wrongfully so, has been Heller's *Mexican American Youth: Forgotten Youth at the Crossroads*. Heller ascribes various attributes to the Chicano family, which she contends contribute to the delinquency of Chicano youth. She criticizes the Chicano upbringing as blocking advancement into the Anglo society by stressing values that hinder mobility; values such as family ties, honor, masculinity, living in the present, the stressing of courtesy and politeness. Heller claims Chicano parental love is not conditional, it is not dependent on the child's level of performance as compared with his peers. The child does not have a standard of excellence imposed on him. In addition, he is trained for dependent behavior (especially close to the mother), while the Anglo is trained for independent behavior. The indulgent attitudes of the Chicana mother tend to hamper achievement of the child. "This lack of making good," according to Heller, "is consistent with the theme of fatalism and resignation which runs through the M-A culture." Therefore, Heller's study describes the Chicano as being held down by the family, that the Chicano parents are the child's own worst enemy. And who is the person that deals more with the child—the mother. Therefore she is to blame. Another widely quoted writer, William Madsen, an anthropologist, describes the Chicano family in his book, *The Mexican American in South Texas*. Madsen claims that the Chicano family is the main obstacle to the advancement of the child because of the strong family ties demanding that one put the family above the self. Madsen's description of the family roles is typical of many writers. He contends that as the child grows into middle childhood, the father avoids demonstrations of affection, but the mother remains close to the child. Sex and age determine the roles of the family members (older male children are more respected). Madsen goes to great lengths to describe the Chicana as being submissive and that the Chicana wife gratefully submits to physical abuse by the Chicano husband. The male is described as showing his machismo (his manliness) by having affairs. In the literature on the Chicana, sex roles are very clearly defined. There is usually an unquestioning acceptance of the masculinity or machismo cult concerning the Chicano male. The male is therefore labeled as one who has a tendency to male superiority and a dominance through multiple sexual conquests. And the Chicana is described as defenseless and submissive to the macho.

Another description of the Chicana which is a typical one that runs through the literature is in the book *The New Nursery School*. Nimnicht, McAfee, and Mier in this book used many of the Martin Deutsch studies on "deprived" children as a basis for their nursery school program. The recipients of this program were Chicano children in Greeley, Colorado. The Chicano child is described as living in an environmentally deprived home, in a large family where the father may not be able to support his family. Therefore, the mother needs to go out and work, making her tired and worried with little energy or time left to devote to her children. Although this program is no longer in operation, the descriptions of Chicanos are typical of the programs that claimed that the Chicano was deprived and to succeed in school he must become an English-speaking, middle class white.

I could go on and on in describing the literature on the Chicana, but I think you get the picture. The home, as described by the literature, is culturally deprived, linguistically disadvantaged, economically deprived, culturally deficient, etc. Nick Vaca, in his excellent article in the Chicano journal *El Grito*, reviewed the literature of the social scientists on the Chicano and concluded that the dominant social science theory is one that holds that the Chicano culture is composed of values that are detrimental to the child. Therefore, according to this theory, to succeed in school, the child must change his language and culture. In popularizing this theory, the social scientist, Vaca contends, used so-called scientific evidence to blame the cause of low academic achievement of the Chicano from the guilty institutions onto the Chicano. Many authors are now criticizing this theory. The culturally deprived theory, which is based on a hierarchical concept that one culture is superior to others, needs to be questioned and disclaimed.

Deprived, deficient, disadvantaged, submissive, disorganized, these are all descriptions of the Chicana and her child-rearing practices. What does it mean to her? It means because of the differences in culture, she has been stereotyped as inferior, rather than what she is—culturally different. What does it mean to be labeled inferior? People learn who they are and what they are from how they have been treated by those around them. People develop feelings that they are liked, wanted, accepted from having been liked, wanted, and accepted. To produce a healthy self, it is necessary to provide experiences in which individuals are accepted. So what does it do to the Chicana who is told that she is not a good mother? This has deep psychological implications not only for the mother, but also for her children, who are in her care, especially her daughters.

For the Chicana, being stereotyped as inferior because she comes from a culture that is not Anglo English-speaking middle class means that she has to refute these stereotypes for her psychological and cultural survival. Her child-rearing practices should not be deemed inferior because they are different. For too long minority groups have been attributed a subordinate status because "authorities" argue that one cultural tradition is better than others. Our society and specifically education must appreciate the various cultures that are part of our heritage. The concept of cultural pluralism, that is providing the student the opportunity to retain his language and culture while at the same time learning English, is an essential philosophical basis for any educational setting which serves Chicano children.

In addition, the Chicana, because of stereotypes, is not considered for any occupations except menial jobs. For isn't she inferior, unable to teach her children, unable to inspire them? The majority of Chicanas now employed are in the lowest paying jobs, such as migrant farm laborers and power machine operators. When I was going to college, for instance, my sisters were the most supportive of my getting an education. "We don't want you to work in sweat shops as we had to," they would tell me. The stereotype of the Chicana to work in only the lowest of jobs also has to be refuted. The bilingual-bicultural talents are a great asset and she should be allowed to develop them, in addition to all her other talents.

And what about the Chicana's family, especially her daughters? In schools, they are usually considered for vocational education. The Chicana is not considered for occupations such as a scientist, lawyer, historian, etc. In fact, Chicanas are usually counseled as noncollege material—for aren't they going to get married right away and have many babies? Counselors and teachers should not have low expectations of the Chicana, but encourage her to go to college and get the full benefits of education.

The Chicana has many strengths that have been overlooked. The Chicano family, despite poverty and discrimination, has been a close family unit, mainly because of the mother. The strong force in the home has been the mother. Chicano children grow up revering and loving their mothers. But this respect is one that has been earned and one that lasts a lifetime despite the passage of time and long distances.

On the positive side, Chicanas are emerging into leadership positions. Alicia Escalante, in Los Angeles, as head of the National Chicana Welfare Rights Organization, is battling for better conditions for the welfare mother. In Delano, California, headquarters of the National Farmworkers Union, Dolores Huerta holds one of the highest positions in the organization. Marta Bustamante, in Sacramento, California, is organizing the low income and welfare mother. Las Mujeres de Bronce, a Chicana organization in San Pedro, California, was recently formed by Patricia Duran. In Michigan, Jane Gonzales is working with the Chicanas. Teresa Aragon de Shepro, as Assistant Provost for the University of Washington, is an inspiration to all Chicanas. A sociologist from U.C.L.A., Deluvina Hernandez has written an excellent monograph, *Mexican American Challenge to a Sacred Cow*, a critique on the research on Chicano high school dropouts in East Los Angeles. Lilia Aceves heads the recently funded Chicana Service Center in East Los Angeles, the first of its kind in the nation. Hope Lugo, a former Head Start mother, is now the director of the Napa County Economic Opportunity Commission, which distributes antipoverty funds in Napa County, California. Lupe Anguiano has worked for the Chicana through federal agencies in Washington, D.C. Some Chicanas have run for elected office: Rhea Mojica Hammer in Chicago, Margarita Castro in San Diego, and Marta Cortero in Crystal City, Texas. In Los Angeles, Silvia Castillo and Ana Neito-Gomez have developed a Chicana anthology. The National Chicana Foundation, comprised of university women throughout the United States, is devoted to research on the Chicana. Chicana classes are now emerging on many college campuses—U.C.L.A., U.C. Irvine, U.C. Berkeley, California State University at Northridge, and California State Polytechnic University at Pomona.

The time has come to look at the Chicana for what she is. She is not inferior, she is different. What is deprived about being different? The stereotypes of the Chicana must cease. She is an individual and a member of a rich culture, who must be treated as such. Then and only then will the Chicana reach her full potential. The stereotypes of the Chicana must be torn down by society accepting and appreciating cultural differences—not by attempting to obliterate them.

9

Black Woman

Vistula S. Chapman

In 1939 E. Franklin Frazier asserted in *The Negro Family in the United States* that the Black family was matriarchal and disorganized as a result of slavery. In the following decades, most sociologists followed this same line of thought. Black families were compared with White families (considered the norm) in attitude and behavior, and because they deviated, they were considered abnormal and unhealthy. None of the studies dealt with the structural effects of oppression or with any specific ways to change the social system so that it would no longer produce devastating effects on Black people. Blacks in general and Black women in particular became stigmatized for not conforming to the American Way. In the 1960s the Moynihan Report consecrated this myth with governmental approval.

To see the invalidity of placing the label "matriarchal" on the Black family, one should first examine the definition of matriarchy. Webster's *Third New International Dictionary* defines matriarchy as—

> A system of social organization in which descent is traced solely or primarily through the female line and in which inheritance of property and social prerogatives is sometimes also established in the same way.

According to this definition Black women could not—nor have ever been—matriarchal in this country. Such legal powers have never been relegated to her. And how could such a structure be inherited from the legacy of slavery? The slave system did not engender or recognize a matriarchal family structure. Inherent in the concept of matriarchy is power. How could it be possible for the slaveholding class to openly acknowledge symbols of authority in their slaves, especially female slaves? Such an acknowledgement would be a threat to the slave system, for such concentrations of authority would have caused even more widespread rebellion than there was. "Any type of social structure in which Black people might forge a collective and conscious existence, the American slave system strove to destroy."[1] Legal marriage did not exist for a slave. Families were brutally separated—children more frequently than not were separated from their mothers. Black mothers were rarely allowed to guide their children to maturity. However, Black children, such as Frederick Douglass, often did have minimal contact with at least one member of their immediate family group—a grandmother, aunt, or uncle, for example, and these strong personal bonds between child and family members persisted despite separation.[2] Perhaps this contributed greatly to Black people's ability to survive the disorder which was imposed on their lives.

This is not to say that strong bonds were not developed between mother and child during slavery. There are numerous slave narratives about mothers slipping away in the night from one plantation to another to visit their children:

> I was grander upon my mother's knee than a king upon his throne. . . . I dropped off to sleep, and waked in the morning to find my mother gone. . . . My mother had walked twelve miles to see me, and had the same distance to travel again before the morning sunrise.[3]

It should be noted that Black mothers suffered immeasurable grief when separated from their children. Oft times mothers chose death for themselves and their children rather than experience the humiliation and torture of slavery, separation, and the total denial of their humanity:

> My mother told me that he (the slave master) owned a woman who was the mother of seven children, and when her babies would get about a year or two of age he'd sell them and it would break her heart. She never got to keep them. When her fourth baby was born and was about two months old, she just studied all the time about how she would have to give it up, and one day she said, "I just decided I'm not going to let ol' master sell this baby; he just ain't going

> to do it." She got up and gave it something out of a bottle and pretty soon it was dead.[4]

Such accounts support the thesis that "the designation of the Black woman as a matriarch is a cruel misnomer. It is a misnomer because it implies a stable kinship structure within which the mother exercises decisive authority. It is cruel because it ignores the profound traumas the Black woman must have experienced when she had to surrender her childbearing to alien and predatory economic interests."[5]

The question which now arises is what was the Black man's role in defending his family against these oppressive measures of slavery. In the past it has been generally assumed that Black men did very little—next to nothing—to defend their wives, children, and mothers. These assumptions were made to perpetuate the myth of the docile, impotent Black male and the strong, matriarchal Black female. However there are numerous historical accounts of Black men lashing out against slavery:

> Now, I ask you, had you not rather be killed than be a slave to a tyrant, who takes the life of your mother, wife, and dear little children? Look upon your mother, wife, and children, and answer God Almighty; and believe this, that it is no more harm for you to kill a man, who is trying to kill you, than it is for you to take a drink of water when thirsty; in fact, the man who will stand still and let another murder him, is worse than an infidel, and; if he has common sense, ought not be pitied. (David Walker's Appeal)[6]

and oft times Black men received severe punishment for their actions:

> His right ear had been cut off close to his head, and he had received a hundred lashes on his back. He had beaten the overseer for a brutal assault on my mother, and this was his punishment. Furious at such treatment, my father became a different man, and was so morose, disobedient, and intractable, that Mr. N. decided to sell him. He accordingly parted with him, not long after, to his son who lived in Alabama; and neither mother nor I ever heard from him again.[7]

Such accounts bear witness to the fact that Black men were neither docile nor impotent, nor did they accept secondary roles (primary roles being designated to the slaveholder) in the lives of their wives, children, and mothers.

What is the Black woman's slave legacy? "The plantation system did not differentiate between the sexes in exploiting slave labor,"[8] and this helped create a different type of womanhood for Blacks. The Black woman was neither sheltered nor protected. To obtain maximum labor from his slaves, the slaveholder created very few sex-designated jobs. As a result Black women worked alongside Black men in the fields, toiling under the lash from sunup to sundown. The alleged benefits of the ideology of femininity did not accrue to her. The result was a strong Black woman who was able to play a dominant role *alongside* the Black man in the numerous slave revolts:

> In New Orleans one day in 1730 a woman slave received 'a violent blow from a French soldier for refusing to obey him" and in her anger shouted "that the French should not long insult Negroes." As it was later disclosed, she and undoubtedly many other women, had joined in a vast plan to destroy slaveholders. Along with eight men, this dauntless woman was executed. Two days later, Louisiana pronounced a woman and four men leaders of a planned rebellion. They were all executed and, in a typically savage gesture, their heads publicly displayed on poles.
>
> Charleston, South Carolina condemned a black woman to die in 1740 for arson, a form of sabotage frequently carried out by women. In Maryland, for instance, a slave woman was executed in 1776 for having destroyed by fire her master's house, his outhouses and tobacco house.[9]

In short, slavery created a type of egalitarianism between Black men and women.

Today the myth of the Black matriarchy is proposed to be valid in defining the Black woman. This is due mainly to the popular Moynihan Report (*The Negro Family: The Case for National Action*). Because about 3 out of every 10 Black households are headed by females,[10] Moynihan asserted that the Black family had reached a stage of breakdown.

Moynihan's assumptions are both sexist and racist. First off, he assumes that if Black females appropriately submit to male dominance, all problems within the Black community (e.g., street crime, juvenile delinquency, unemployment, etc.) would be solved. And second, he fails to see the reality of Black people—that they have necessarily created relationships different from those based on White norms. Because of racism Black people's survival has depended

upon a type of equality between Black males and Black females (what needed to be done was done and w ıose job it was to do it was irrelevant!)—this is Black peoples' slave legacy. For Black people to have imitated Whites in their personal relationships would have been detrimental to their survival. They would have developed the type of dissention and antagonism that White men and women are now openly experiencing—hence the "women's movement."

Black women are victims both of racism and sexism. Contrary to the myth that Black females have received "special" privileges from White society, the Black woman is one of the most disadvantaged in American society. First off in education: although the median number of years of formal education obtained by Black women exceeds that of Black males, the quantitative difference by sex is insignificant:

> For those 25 years or more of age in 1940, the quantitative difference between the median educational level of Black females (6.1 years) and Black males (5.4 years) was 0.7, or less than one year of schooling. By 1960, respective data were 8.4 years for the females and 7.7 years for the males, or a difference of 0.7. By 1970, the difference between females (10.0 years) and the males (9.4) was 0.6. Such minute differences in educational attainment failed to provide Black females with any significant "headstart" in the labor force.[11]

It should also be noted that much of the higher education Black females have received has been largely at the traditional teacher-training institutions, and this in itself limits occupational patterns greatly.

In regard to employment, the Black woman has the greatest access to the worst jobs at the lowest earnings. Contrary to the myth, employed Black males have outnumbered employed Black females during this century:

> In 1910, Black males comprised 61.2 percent of all employed Blacks. In 1920, they were 67.4 percent of all employed Blacks; in 1930, 66.6 percent; in 1940, 65.6 percent; 65.2 percent in 1950; 60.2 percent in 1960; and 57.0 percent in 1970.[12]

Black males h ve traditionally outnumbered Black females in the labor force, and unemployment rates have been generally higher among Blacks females than Black males.

When one examines income data, one is immediately struck by the fact that Black women are again at the bottom of the totem pole. In 1970, the wage scale for Black women was the lowest of all: (Ninety-two percent of all "non-Whites" are Black.)

White Males	$9373
Non-White Males	$6598
White Females	$5490
Non-White Females	$4674[13]

Women have always represented a surplus labor supply within the American capitalist system. They have been systematically controlled and exploited by that system. They are paid less for the same work that men do, and for those jobs specifically relegated to women, they are low-paid and receive little advancement. Black women have suffered to the greatest extent from economic exploitation, and the effect of this on the Black community has yet to be measured.

The Black woman has also suffered from psychological exploitation. Brought to these shores to be used as a labor force and a breeder, she represented the antithesis of "womanhood" in American culture. Her physical being—black skin, thick lips, short kinky hair—was the negation of America's lily-white standard of femininity. The result was a "castrated" Black woman. (The remnants of this can still be seen today, even in this age of Black Is Beautiful and Black Power.) However despite this psychological degradation, the Black woman developed a strength and endurance which became a dominant force in the survival of Black people in America.

Should the Black woman join the White woman in the woman's movement because of the similarity of issues, even though the problems behind the issues are different? Perhaps this question should only be answered by each Black woman herself. My feelings on this are that any White group that does not have an anti-imperialistic and antiracist ideology has nothing to offer the Black woman. It is not male chauvinism that is the villain. The villain is the system which created this chauvinism, and racism and sexism are the instruments used to perpetuate this system against which Black people are involved in a life-and-death struggle. The Black woman in her survival struggle is combating the capitalist, racist exploitation of her people. For her, male chauvinism means nothing. Her man, the Black man, for the large part is not a male chauvinist. Male chauvinism exists only among those Black men who have bought the system and have become Black Anglo-Saxons—imitating White people. When White women recognize the true villain of oppression in this society, barriers between peoples will dissolve. The path will lie open toward understanding and integration for all people within a new society.

10

Varieties of Denial

Florence Howe

If any of you is a son or daughter of first or second-generation immigrants, then perhaps you remember as I do the first days of school, when you were five or six years old and learned very quickly the value placed on "correct" English, English without a "foreign" accent, indeed the value of being "American" and not foreign at all. Perhaps you, too, denied your own heritage, buried your ethnic and class origins. After several days at school, I told my grandmother who commonly addressed me in Yiddish, "Bubbie, speak to me in English. I'm an American and I won't answer unless you do." And perhaps your family, like mine, was generous to pert youngsters and felt awed by the American educational system as well. And so my grandmother and others in my family did make an effort to "speak to me in English."

Black children, of course, can and often do change their language patterns at the command of the schools, though they cannot change the color of their skins and Americanize in the way that European immigrants could and did. The children of Latin Americans face problems similar both to Black children and to Europeans who arrived in the United States with a language other than English. But some Latins, in these days of political consciousness, are holding fast to their language and their culture—and I for one can only cheer them on.

I begin with these notes about class, race, and ethnicity, not to detract from the basic issue—sex role stereotyping—but rather to underscore the inevitable connections among "varieties of denial." Each of these groups, and others in the U.S.—working class ethnics, Blacks, Latins, Asians—has had similar problems to solve: What is their language? What is their history? Where is their identity? For girls and women in these groups the denial is dual. From my maternal grandfather, for example, I got the message that girls were useful only for housekeeping and reproduction. Fortunately for me, my mother, a daughter who had been deprived of her vocational ambitions, produced her own independent message: "You," she told me from almost the first day I set foot in school, "are going to be the teacher I could not become." But of course it was "teacher" and not doctor or lawyer or engineer. Though I am not complaining, I was one of the lucky ones.

I want to tell you about some who were not so lucky, at least until very recently. I am going to describe in part a class I taught last year at Old Westbury in the history of women's education in the U.S. They were an unusual group. All females, their ages ranged from twenty to past fifty; they were racially, religiously, ethnically, and in personal and economic terms diverse. Most of them wanted to become teachers. All of them had been educated in our elementary and secondary schools during the past several decades.

I began with the following question on the opening evening: What was the single most crucial experience in your educational life? Tell me of an experience that either established the direction of your life or changed its course dramatically.

The person who began was the oldest woman in the class, Sophie Zimmerman's story went back in time more than thirty-five years to when she was seventeen. That year, her mother had told her of a small sum of money in a bank account that she meant to use to send her to college. Sophie was her youngest, and she, at least, would have this special advantage. But then, suddenly, Sophie's mother died without telling anyone else of her plan for the money. Sophie was sent to live first with married sisters and finally to keep house for two bachelor brothers. There was the perfect solution: it was the 1930s, when money and jobs were scarce; the brothers had jobs and needed a housekeeper. No one asked the young woman what she wanted to do. No one guessed that she wanted to go to college, and she herself assumed

that no one would believe her if she mentioned her mother's plan. She spent four years housekeeping for her brothers and then escaped into her own domesticity by marrying. She bore and reared a number of children and, now that they were grown and educated, she was—more than thirty years later—finally at college.

The second person to speak was one of the young ones in the class. At the age of twenty-two Alice Grunfeld had already been a dropout and was now returning to college as a married student. Her older brother had dropped out of college several months before she had. Her family had greeted her brother's dropping out with alarm, and when he chose to return a year later had given a huge party to celebrate the event. When Alice had dropped out, the action, she said, made hardly a ripple in the family's life. When she had decided to return, there were discussions about whether she really ought to. After all, she had a good job now and could save money for a house and furnishings. She had married and would soon have children. Why go to college, they said. It would be a waste of money. Alice concluded her story to the class by reporting that she was pregnant and that, for the first time in her life, she knew what it was to be valued by her family. "I don't need to do another thing ever," Alice said. "I have had all the glory I ever thought it was possible for me, *a mere girl*, to have. I have never felt so loved by my family as now that I am about to have a baby. But as for my going to college, almost everyone considers it a waste of time."

Had nothing changed in thirty years? That question did not need an explicit answer, for diverse stories reported a consistent theme. The education of women was relatively unimportant compared to the education of men. And where it was considered at all, it was relegated to the status of a diversion; when it became other than a diversion, it was considered a threat.

Thus, one woman reported that her husband had at first approved the idea of her returning to college after an interruption of some twenty years. But when she began to refuse social engagements because she had to write a paper or study for an exam, he was not pleased. Other women acknowledged that their husbands felt threatened by the prospect of a wife with a college degree.

An observer that evening might have drawn several other conclusions from the stories that were told. With two exceptions (being my own story and one of race prejudice that involved a teacher), these stories about a "crucial educational experience" focussed not on educational institutions and personnel but on the attitudes of family members or husbands toward a daughter's or wife's education. And in all instances, whatever the story, the woman's attitude was never aggressive about her own desires or needs. In every case, women accepted passively (in one case, actively) the role assigned to them or deferred to a more convenient time —even twenty or thirty years hence—their own interests or futures. Indeed, to some of these women, the idea of having their own interests or futures was still a novelty.

One of the first purposes of the class I have described was to establish the education of women as a social problem, not a question of individual laziness or an individual's lack of motivation or drive. Two ingredients were essential to that purpose. First, sharing personal experiences established the presence of social patterns rather than individual hang-ups. We needed no sociological report to tell us that we had all accepted passively the notion of female inferiority, male superiority—in education and in everyday life. That was obvious. But the more difficult question was why had we done so, and was it inevitable that we should? Could the social pattern be altered?

The second ingredient—history—helped with those questions. As we read the lives of eighteenth- and nineteenth-century women, we searched especially for their significant educational experiences and for their views of education. What education had Elizabeth Cady Stanton or Harriet Tubman managed to get and to what use had she put it? The students discovered that the social patterns of their contemporary lives had historical roots and that something could be learned from studying that history. Students began to generalize about women like Stanton and Tubman who struggled for what education they could get—and much of it was not formal schooling or even what we would call book-learning at all. They used their education, moreover, socially and politically. In their daily lives, they taught others

—either on the lecture platform or on the underground railroad. What emerged from discussions of women in the past was a sense not only of individual achievement but, more importantly, of commitment to social change.

At the last meeting, the class evaluated the course. They had learned a good deal about the subject they had studied —the education of women. Even more important, the course had, they said, "changed their lives." The specific examples offered had several features in common: they were confident in tone and, if not aggressive, at least assertive in quality ("I now take myself and my studies seriously"); they hearkened back to the beginning by their reference to family life ("I have begun to talk with my husband about our lives together and to explain to him how I feel about getting an interesting job and having him share household responsibilities"); most of all, they were future-oriented and socially committed ("I am going to be a lawyer—I don't care what my family or anyone else thinks about that. As a lawyer, I can be useful to the women's movement").

This was the most interesting result of the course: that studying history—their own history, of course—made women future-oriented and socially committed. They were saying, "Here I am, beginning to understand how I got into this state of mind and material circumstance, and even how whole generations of women got here from the nineteenth century and before. Now, on the basis of that new awareness and understanding, I can think about the future and about changing the way things are." The pattern is very simple. Until you have a history, you have no future. For women it is a new experience, partly because our history has been totally obscure to us, partly also because we have tended, in the manner of *man*kind, to internalize social problems as personal ones and so imagine them accessible only to individual rather than social solutions.

While schools cannot solve social problems, they can illuminate them. Indeed, one of their prime functions is precisely that: to enlighten students about their present and their past. Or to facilitate students' enlightening each other, as in the class I have described. But I would add to the curriculum the future. We must not simply learn about the past for its own sake or to understand the present, but to imagine and even plot paths to the future. Many women's studies courses are organized in this way and for obvious reasons. To study the past and to understand the present are only the first half of women's educational needs. As Kenneth Clark has said in another context: Why study a slum except to change it, or a disease except to eliminate it?

Curriculum in general ought to include attempts at outlining a series of alternative routes along which we may move towards change. Whatever those paths, they would suggest to students a fundamental notion that now seems excluded from education at all levels. Despite the fact that we have witnessed massive technological change in our own lifetimes, most of us have been taught that human nature—however defined—does not change, indeed cannot change. Men are men, and women are women. Social institutions like marriage and the family are allegedly unalterable. People have always been prejudiced and always will be—and so forth. If we believe that things are as they are, then indeed there is no hope for change. And if we have no energy for change, there is no hope.

Change is slow, difficult, and costly, at least in terms of time and energy. There are few, if any, shortcuts. One must have either an appetite for change or a stake in it. Change is not pleasant for those content with the status quo or for those who covet stability.

The class I described met for seventeen evenings, some of them stormy sessions, confused and exhausting for all. The students read ten novels, a volume of history, six or seven essays, and sufficient autobiographical or biographical material to produce two papers each on the education of particular women. Most of the students, moreover, had also attended a previous introductory women's studies course that had met for ten evenings. The period of "change" for those women, therefore, had been a year. And while I am sanguine about the process having begun, it is a process and it was only a beginning.

Ultimately, of course, change depends on two factors: first, the energy with which feminists can teach others—masses of others, who will then teach still others, in colleges and in public schools; and second, the willingness of men (and some few women) in power to facilitate the process of change. (A word about feminists: I use the word to mean energetic "advocates" of equal opportunity for women. Men may be feminists, just as women may be anti-feminists.)

Nineteenth-century feminists like Emma Willard, who in 1821 founded Troy Seminary, the first secondary school for

women in the country, and Mary Lyon, who a decade later founded Mt. Holyoke, the first women's college, knew what they were doing when they set goals for themselves. "I will not be content," one of them said, "until I have sent two hundred teachers into the world." These women knew that in their day only women teachers would care about and feel responsible for the education of other female students. And they were, in their day and for some time afterwards, correct. But something interfered with that process late in the nineteenth century, as more and more women became teachers. Feminist energies were concentrated increasingly on the issue of suffrage. At the same time, women were trained as teachers not because of their commitment to the education of women but because they could be hired more cheaply than men. Whatever the factors, the result is clear: women teachers at some point in time no longer were feminists. The schools feminists had founded endured and women passed through them—but the institutions were drained of their feminist content and their commitment to change. It is hardly surprising that, once feminists lost control of the education of women, women were educated to believe in their own limited capacities and in the unlimited capacities of males.

Our chief goal now is obvious: to restore a feminist perspective to education. Laws and guidelines provide us with a major step forward. The length and duration of that step will depend on the two factors I listed earlier: the energy of feminist educators and the willingness of those in power to facilitate change. Of all the methods at hand, I would place priority upon the reeducation and education of teachers in the system. These are, in my opinion, the significant people, the crucial agents for change, since most of them are both women and teachers.

On these people rests the responsibility for perpetuating the sexual stereotypes that have had us in their grip or for breaking that mold. And yet, of course, teachers, like the women in my class, have been *denied* their history, their culture, even a just portion of the language. When we were little children, what sense did we make of all the "he's" and "him's" we heard? Did we feel included? Or were we, all 50 percent of us, left watching the action from the sidelines, as in all the texts? And where were we in the history books? Where were our grandmothers who had filled the sweatshops or our great-great-grandmothers who had crossed the prairies and built houses and begun towns, sometimes without any menfolk at all? What do we know of "the longest revolution," that struggle for women's rights that is at least as old as the American Revolution? Women have a history, a literature we have barely begun to uncover. There is no legitimate reason for denying women their culture and their history.

What can teachers do? They can insist on their need for in-service courses in women's studies. On campuses around the country there are now some 1,600 women's studies courses. In high schools, there are about 200 that the Clearing-house on Women's Studies knows of. Leaders of these studies and other feminists ought to be recruited into a massive enterprise to reeducate the teachers of this country especially in the following areas: language; history; literature; sex role development, including vocational and other counseling; physical education; and body health needs. That is step one . Step two is the translation by teachers of this material into new curriculum for their students. Think of the scope of that task: new nonsexist, nonracist texts on all levels. New curriculum units in every classroom. New consciousness about nonsexist behavior of teachers in classrooms. Special efforts to encourage girls to study math and science, to enter vocational schools long denied them, to learn sports they have only been allowed to observe. And that is only the beginning.

I shall close by telling you about an elementary school in New York City in which a counselor has begun to work with teachers in a form of consciousness-raising as part of a planned effort to change the sexist behavior of teachers in that school. The principal—a male, of course—invited himself to one of the sessions after they had really begun to function well. He stayed afterwards to talk with the counselor and to compliment her on her success. The teachers with whom she was working had begun to view their behavior critically. They had begun to question, for example, their patterns of segregating boys and girls at the coat hooks, in the lunch lines, etc., and their ways of dealing with the two sexes as they taught different subjects. The teachers' insights had energized them. The principal had felt a sense of power in the room. "The teachers might discover that they can change the school. What about that?" he queried. "That's their job," the counselor said. And I would add, that's the job ahead for all of us this decade and next.

11

Sister and Brother: Getting Ahead Together

Aileen C. Hernandez

Some are suggesting that it is time for Black women to move to the back of the revolution. There is clear and present danger that if we do, the revolution will be aborted and Black people—male and female—will have lost for the second time in 100 years the chance for real freedom.

Historically, the causes of abolition and women's rights were closely intertwined, and many women—Black *and* white—felt they had been betrayed by white males when the Fifteenth Amendment to the Constitution was adopted in 1870 giving the vote to the *Black male*, but leaving women mute in the halls of government. It took 50 years for the shock to wear off and for women to succeed in persuading a male electorate to permit them the right to vote in 1920. Full Constitutional equality for women has still not materialized, and in 1972, 102 years after the Fifteenth Amendment and 52 years after the Nineteenth Amendment, the women of America have again organized to assault male legislative bastions in pursuit of the Equal Rights Amendment which would ban discrimination based on sex. The revolution goes on, and on. No one can be free until all are free.

Black people are beginning to "spell their own name." Identity as a Black is now "in" and we wear our Afros and Dashikis as evidence of our newfound identity. But it's quite possible that the outer trappings of Blackness are covering with a very thin veneer our acceptance of Whitey's concept of women as-second-class citizens in this brave, new world. And we just can't afford to do that. If the revolution is to be won, we need the full involvement, at the highest level of functioning, of both our men and our women. We, as Blacks, can't afford the luxury of male supremacy.

In many ways, Black people are more "together" than white people on the question of the roles of men and women. We don't have to engage in agonizing rhetoric on whether women should work outside the home. Black women have been the breadwinners in *many* families, and important secondary wage earners in most families. The unexpected legacy of slavery and racial discrimination is that Black men, unlike their white brothers, have more experience relating to women of strength and relative economic independence. And Black women, unlike their white sisters, have been forced to play many roles in society—not just the role of wife and mother. Black men, however, have been made to feel less "masculine" and Black women have been made to feel less "feminine" because they are sharing economic and domestic burdens. But now, women's liberation is challenging the old white male system.

And it seems to me that Black people have a headstart on whites in this decade. Clearly defined for the '70s is a revolution in the relationship between men and women. The cry of "freedom now" is being raised around the world on racial grounds, on ethnic grounds, on religious grounds and *on sexual grounds*. The women's liberation movement has burgeoned in the six short years since the founding of the National Organization for Women in October of 1966. NOW, once considered radical and *avant garde*, is now being dubbed the "NAACP" of the Women's Movement, or the "conservative" faction. All these new groups, however, have made little impact among Black women, not because Black women are unconcerned with freedom, but rather because the present dialogue in some women's liberation groups on identity is sort of "first-grade" rhetoric to many Black women and because Black freedom is still a priority for concerned Blacks—male or female. We understand the discussion but we've passed that point. We see a necessity to help Black men achieve their personal identity in a world which has emasculated them, but we would be making a tragic error if we assumed that Black men's progress can be accomplished by Black women stepping back. In reality what would result could not be termed progress for the

male; it would simply be the *illusion* of progress for the male and definite retrogression for the female. The movement for Black freedom cannot afford a backward step—by our women or our men. If freedom is to come, it will come by each of us using our full potential to bring it about. Nothing could be more tragic than to miss out on freedom because we decided to play games by the rules of a society which has virtually excluded us. We have a chance to make new rules for the game, and we are uniquely qualified to do so. We can say "no" to this society's inhumane and sterile definitions of masculinity and femininity and take a leadership role in defining new human relationships.

As Blacks, we should have special empathy for the move toward equality by women. There are many similarities between their struggle and the struggle of Blacks. Both groups have "high visibility" (one is easily distinguished by color; the other by sex). Both groups have played subordinate roles in the society and have been exploited economically (Blacks under the system of slavery, women under the system of marriage). Both groups have been restricted, by laws, from free determination of their lives (Blacks and women have been victims of chattel law theories). Degrading discrimination against both groups was often cloaked in the terminology of the moralist—there was a need to "protect" this inferior group from doing harm to itself. Such was the justification of many who defended Black slavery; such is the justification of many who continue to advocate a "para-slave" status for woman by controlling her economic existence as well. She is the marginal worker to be manipulated as needed in the work force (Rosie the Riveter—national slack-clad, acetylene-torch-welding heroine of the Second World War—banished to baby-producing boredom in suburbia to make room in the economy for the returning G.I.); she is the new slave labor class—reaping praise, instead of pay, as the ubiquitous volunteer, cheerfully exploited by churches, charitable organizations and political parties; she transfers her domestic skills—cooking, cleaning and protecting the "master" of the house from intrusion—to a new location where she makes the coffee, types neat letters and screens callers for the "master" of the office; she takes her superior education into the marketplace and trades her BA, MA or PhD for a new title as "girl Friday" to a male boss who has parlayed the Peter Principle into a sinecure complete with maid service; the jobs she gets are high-skill, but low pay because women "don't need as much money as men"; and she sits and seethes while training her male subordinate to become her boss.

Not content with subjecting women to all these inequities, the male dominated society tries to convince her that it's all for her own good; she's being "protected" from long hours (at time-and-a-half or double-time for overtime) and from lifting "heavy" weights (ranging from 10 to 25 pounds) at high-paying factory jobs (but not at home where grocery bags and children are hoisted a hundred times a day). And all of this "protection" is so that woman can stay healthy enough to fulfill her role as "brood mare" and economic para-slave and full-time domestic slave.

And, as state labor laws "protect" women out of lucrative employment; alimony and divorce laws "protect" women into total dependence (and incidentally severely disadvantage men); abortion laws "protect" women into seeking the services of illegal butchers in order to terminate unwanted pregnancies. Implicit in both forms of discrimination—racial and sex—is the concept that the subordinate group is childlike and incapable of self-determination.

Black women have to be supportive of both revolutions; we are "twice cursed" (if I might paraphrase) by discrimination against Blacks and discrimination against women. Sojourner Truth was an abolitionist and a feminist; Shirley Chisholm is both a fighter for Black equality and for women's equality. But Black men should be supportive of both revolutions, too—*in equal partnership with Black women*. "Sexism" is as virulent a disease as racism; the daily struggle of meeting the stereotyped image of "masculinity" can well be claimed for the fact that men develop more ulcers than women and die at a younger age.

The elimination of racism in the society is an accepted if not yet realized goal. When we also decide that it is important to eliminate "sexism" as well, when some sanity is brought into male-female relationships in the United States, the sigh of relief from American men—of all races—may well be heard around the world.

The goal we should set is freedom for all people—male and female—freedom to develop human potential in a variety of ways unhampered by irrelevant restrictions based on denigrating stereotypes.

Rosa Parks didn't step to the back of the bus; this is no time to have Black women step to the back of the revolution. We move to effectuate this human revolution *together*, or we don't move at all. Right on, Sister *and* Brother.

References

CHAPTER 1

1 Bernard, Jessie. *Women and the Public Interest.* New York: Aldine, 1971. p. 33.

2 Kagan, Jerome. "Check One: Male—Female." *Psychology Today* 3:39-41; July 1969.

3 Ward, William. "Process of Sex Role Development." *Developmental Psychology* 1:163-68; 1969.

4 Stein, Aletha H., and Smithells, Janis. "Age and Sex Differences in Children's Sex Role Standards About Achievement." *Developmental Psychology* 1:252-59; May 1969.

5 Kohlberg, Lawrence. "A Cognitive-Developmental Analysis of Children's Sex Role Concepts and Attitudes." *The Development of Sex Differences.* (Edited by Eleanor Maccoby.) Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1966.

6 Pohlman, Edward H. *Psychology and Birth Planning.* Cambridge, Massachusetts: Shenkman, 1969.

7 Sears, Robert P. "Relation of Early Socialization Experiences to Self Concepts and Gender Roles in Middle Childhood." *Child Development* 41:267-90; June 1970.

8 Maccoby, Eleanor. "Women's Intellect." *The Potential of Woman.* (Edited by Seymour M. Farber and Roger H. Wilson.) New York: McGraw-Hill, 1963.

9 Reimer, Everett. *An Essay on Alternatives in Education.* Cuernavaca, Mexico: CIDOC Guarderno No. 1005, 1970.

10 Levy, Betty. "Sexism, Sex Role and the School's Role in the Sex Role Stereotyping of Girls." 1972. (Unpublished).

11 Freire, Paulo. *Pedagogy of the Oppressed.* New York: Herder and Herder, 1968.

12 Pollack, Jack H. "Are Teachers Fair to Boys?" *Today's Health* 46:20-25; April 1968.

13 Levy, Betty. *Op. cit.*

14 Maccoby, Eleanor. "Sex Differences in Intellectual Functioning." *The Development of Sex Differences.* (Edited by Eleanor Maccoby.) Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1966.

15 Levy, Betty. *Op. cit.*

Acknowledgement is given to Betty Levy's research on sex roles and schools: Levy, Betty. "The School's Role in the Sex Role Stereotyping of Girls: A Feminist Review of the Literature." *Feminist Studies.* Vol. 1, No. 1 Summer 1972.
Levy, Betty. "Do Teachers Sell Girls Short?" *Today's Education* 61:27-29; December 1972.

CHAPTER 8

Deutsch, Martin. "The Disadvantaged Child and the Learning Process." *Education in Depressed Areas.* (Edited by A. Harry Passow.) New York: Teachers College Press, 1963. pp. 163-79.

Heller, Celia S. *Mexican American Youth: Forgotten Youth at the Crossroads.* New York: Random House, 1968. 113 pp.

Hunt, J. McVicker. "The Psychological Basis for Using Pre-School Enrichment as an Antidote for Cultural Deprivation." *Pre-School Education Today.* (Edited by Fred M. Hechinger.) Garden City, New York: Doubleday and Company, Inc., 1966. pp. 25-72.

Madsen, William. *Mexican Americans of South Texas.* New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1964. 112 pp.

Nimnicht, Glen, and others. *Progress Report on Research at the New Nursery School. General Background and Program Rationale.* U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education, Office of Economic Opportunity, sponsoring agency. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, June 1967. 35 pp.

Vaca, Nick C. "The Mexican-American in the Social Sciences." *El Grito* 4:3-24; Spring 1970.

CHAPTER 9

1 Davis, Angela. "Reflections on the Black Woman's Role in the Community of Slaves." *Black Scholar* 3:4; December 1971.

2 Ladner, Joyce. *Tomorrow's Tomorrow: The Black Woman.* New York: Doubleday and Company, Inc., 1971. p. 12.

3 Quarles, Benjamin, editor. *Narrative of the Life of Frederick Douglass, an American Slave, Written by Himself.* Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1960. pp. 35-36.

4 Ladner, Joyce. *Op. cit.* p. 16.

5 Davis, Angela. *Op. cit.* p. 5.

6 Ladner, Joyce. *Op. cit.* p. 18.

7 Frazier, E. Franklin. *The Negro in the United States.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1966 edition. p. 53.

8 Ladner, Joyce. *Op. cit.* p. 21.

9 Davis, Angela. *Op. cit.* p. 10.

10 U.S. Department of Labor, Employment Standards Administration, Women's Bureau. *Facts on Women Workers of Minority Races.* Washington, D.C.: the Bureau, March, 1971. p. 3.

11 U.S. Department of Commerce, Social and Economic Statistics Administration, Bureau of the Census. *We, The American Women.* Washington, D.C.: the Bureau, 1970. p. 5.

12 *Ibid.* Percentages based on *Historical Statistics of the U.S., Colonial Times to 1970.* Series A 93. Washington, D.C.: the Bureau. (In press.)

13 U.S. Department of Labor. *Op. cit.* p. 9.

Biographical Notes
Continued from the front cover.

SHIRLEY D. McCUNE, Manager, Teacher Rights, National Education Association.

Ms. McCune's varied job experience includes classroom teaching, social work, research, and consulting; she belongs to a correspondingly wide range of professional associations. Ms. McCune received the B.A. degree from the Colorado State College of Education, the M.S.W. degree from the University of Denver, and the D.S.W. degree from the Catholic University of America.

MICHELE D. RUSSELL, Race Relations Consultant, Detroit, Michigan.

Ms. Russell was formerly on the staff of the Detroit Industrial Mission. She has been a guest lecturer on Black art, history, and politics, and the psychology of racism; research assistant and editor of the McCone Commission Advisory Report on the History of Race Riots in the U.S.; and consultant to the Los Angeles Human Relations Commission on police-community relations and racism. Ms. Russell has written "Erased, Debased, and Encased: The Dynamics of Black Education Colonization in America" (*College English*, April 1970) and "Notes Toward a Radical Course in Black Literature" (*The Radical Teacher*, Winter 1969). She received the B.A. degree from the University of Southern California and is a Ph.D. candidate at Brown University.

CECILIA C-R SUAREZ, Associate Professor of Education, California Polytechnical State University, Pomona, California.

Ms. Suarez is chairperson of both the National Chicana Foundation and the Los Angeles Head Start agency, MENA. She previously taught in elementary and junior high school and directed a Community Action program and a bilingual bicultural Head Start training program through the UCLA Chicano Studies Department. Ms. Suarez received the M.A. degree from Cal State, Los Angeles, and is completing her doctoral studies at UCLA.

CELESTE ULRICH, Professor of Health, Physical Education, and Recreation, University of North Carolina, Greensboro, North Carolina. Ms. Ulrich is currently vice-president of the American Association for Health, Physical Education, and Recreation as well as chairperson of the AAHPER Physical Education Division.

Ms. Ulrich is the author of *The Growing Years—Adolescence* (AAPHER, 1962) and *The Social Matrix of Physical Education* (Prentice-Hall, 1968). Ms. Ulrich received the B.S. and M.A. degrees from the University of North Carolina and the Ph.D. degree from the University of Southern California.

LOUISE R. WHITE, Director, Teachers Corps, Washington, D.C.

Ms. White was a history, English, and drama teacher. She also worked in Los Angeles as an interviewer for KTTV, educational consultant to the city schools program, management specialist to the Economic Youth Opportunities Agency, and probation counselor for the county probation department. Ms. White is a past director of the Conference on the Black Woman's Agenda and is the author of many publications, including: "The Black Woman's Agenda," "Limited Employment Opportunities for Women," "Implications of New Divorce Law in California," and "A Perspective of Community Involvement in Education." Ms. White received the B.A. degree from Arkansas State College, the M.A. degree from California State University, and the Ph.D. degree from Claremont Graduate School.